1. Thes. 4. 11 Act. 20. 28. 1 Pet. 5. 2.

ligion; require that we ſhould firſt look vnto our owne eſtate, and to the flock that dependeth vpon vs. This controverſie being firſt diſcuſſed, I doubt not but the lawfulnes of communion with the Church of England, will in great meaſure be manifeſted hereby, and a way prepared for them that are yet in errour to diſcerne the ſame. Mr. Ainſworth in his writings againſt me doth very often appeale vnto and call for the Iudgement of the Reader; herein I agree with him and do therfore alſo publiſh & preſent theſe things vnto the view of Chriſtian Readers: and have devided his laſt writing into [illegible], not leaving out (to my knowledge) any one of his words; for [illegible] that would compare things together, and ſo judge the more perfectly. The God of all grace bleſſe theſe weak endevours to the praiſe of his holy name and comfort of his people. Amen.

J. P.

AN

ARROVV AGAINST THE

Separation of the Brovvnistes.

THe Occasion of this writing: Whereas N. N. coming lately out of England into the Low countries, desired to receive the Lords supper with us: she was upon iust occasion wished, first to procure a testimony of her conversation out of England. And while she refused so to do, it was signified unto her, that she could not be admitted for a member of the Church with us. After this also falling into speech of mariage with one of the separation, she then began to leave our assemblie and went unto the meeting of the Brownistes, pretending scruple of conscience about our use of the Lords prayer, as also about the truth of our Church & ministery: and requested me both by her self & others to deale with Mr. Ainsworth about these things. Hereupon partly through her request, and partly through other provocations, I wrote unto Mr. Ainsworth, as followeth.

Salutations in the Lord.

Mr. Ainsworth; I vnderstand by divers witnesses that I am often and odiously provoked to confer with you, & especial by M. Baker who boasteth much against me, that I wil not be brought to reason with you, that I dare not, that that day will never be seene, &c. but for your self I think

you have reaſon to iudge otherwiſe. This provocation is (as I heare) vehemētly againe renewed this week by the ſame Mr, B. & this upon occaſion of a certaine mayde who pretendeth that ſhe is troubled to ioyne with our Church becauſe of the uſe of the Lords prayer among us; becauſe of my calling vnto this Church, whereof I am a Miniſter, which calling he telles her is vnlawfull; & becauſe there is no difference betwixt vs and the Church of England: concerning theſe particulars, not mentioning as yet any other vnto me ſhe ſaith that ſhe deſires ſatisfaction by a conference betwixt you & me; If therefore you will take vpon you to prove that ſhe hath iuſt cauſe to refuſe the communion of our Church, either for any of theſe 3 cauſes or afterwardes for any other if theſe will not ſerve, I am ready by the grace of God to defend the cōtrary againſt you. And this I am content to do, not for any deſire that I have to bring her into the communion of our Church, vnles I could heare better teſtimony of her, then as yet I have found; but to remoove offence, and to ſtop the mouthes of ſuch as cauſeleſly do inſult againſt me & againſt the Church of God. To this end, if either you require a more private conference and will take vnto you, two or three perſons for witneſſe, I am willing either to come vnto you at your owne houſe or to waite for you at mine, taking alſo as many witneſſes vnto me. Or if you pleaſe to ſet downe in writing any arguments concerning theſe points above mentioned, I am willing by writing alſo to give you an anſwer. Or if you deſire a more ſolemne and publique diſputation touching theſe things, I will not refuſe the ſame vpō equal conditions, viz. that the arguments & anſwers may be written; that ſome grave & iudicious men may be preſent, who may both be able to iudge of things ſpoken and by their authority may better keep in order the multitude that ſhalbe preſent; that this meeting may be in convenient time and place, &c.

July 12 *N. ſt.* 1617.

IOHN PAGET.

Reſalutations in the Lord.

Mr. Paget, I know not of any ſuch provocation to conference as you write of, neyther know I the Woman that would joyne unto you. Wherfore if any thing paſs betweene you and me, your ſelf ſhal unto me be the firſt provoker of it. And if you deſire it, I wil not refuſe: and it ſhalbe at your own choiſe, Whether by Word or Writing, and What point or points you wil confer about. As I love not to begin controverſie, ſo neyther Will I be wanting to doe any good I can, to you or any other: or to defend any point of trueth Which God hath given me to ſee and witneſs, When I am duly called therunto. So reſt I yours in all Chriſtian dutie. The 12. of the 7. Moneth, 1617.

Henr. Ainſworth.

Peace & truth from the Prince of Peace.

Mr. Ainſ. beſides the provocation of your people, which you hold not to be a ſufficient cauſe of any thing paſſing between you and me, I take it that I am by your ſelf alſo much provoked, & that divers wayes; not onely by your general doctrine of ſeparation, which is in it ſelf a cōmon provocation vnto all the Churches of Chriſte, and a beginning of controverſy, but in ſpecial by your particular mentioning of my name in your publique congregatiō & ſpeaking againſt my calling, as formerly ſo alſo this laſt week againe as I heare: by ſpeaking againſt the particular congregation whereof I am a Miniſter, & condemning communion therewith by name: by cauſing ſuch members of your Church as have heard a Sermon in ours, to make publique cōfeſſion of their fault, & to repent openly for the ſame: and further even by this your large

offer of conference either by word or writing, about what poynts I would, and this to do me good, though for the present we take it, you have done vs no good but much evill & wrong in the particulars above mentioned.

Hereupon I am mooved to desire you, according to your offer to set downe in writing your reasons to prove that the vse of the Lords prayer among vs; that the vnlawfulnes of my calling; that our agreement with England: & that the Temple where we meete for the worship of God are any iust causes of refusing communion with vs. Since my last writing vnto you, I heare that you alledged the place of our assembling togather as a bar of communion vnto that man, against whom you presently threaten your censure for coming vnto vs; And therfore I desire you to set downe your reasons concerning this 4th matter also, or any other of our wants which might keep you from communicating with vs. And having receyved your reasons I wil also endevor by mine answer to do you good, & if the Lord will to bring you vnto the comfortable communion with the Churches of Christ from all which you are yet a stranger: Then might you be in truth, mine in all Christian dueties, as you

*Ps. 55. 13. 14. Act. 2. 1. 46 & 3. 1.

write, whereas now in many of the * cheefest of them, you are not: Then should I also reioyce to be, in a greater measure then I am, your loving brother in the Lord

July 18. 1617. John Paget.

The high-way of the upright, is to depart from evil: He that keepeth his way, preserveth his soule. Pro. 16. 17.

I Have no reason, Mr. Paget, to hold that a sufficient provocation unto me, which never was: none have ever solicited me to controvert with you, but now your self. By our general doctrine of separation, you may freely (I confesse) take occasion to deale, if you can disprove

prove it: but our doctrine & proofs are in publick: so you might have had reasons from thence, to reply upon as you saw good, you needed not have called upon me for mor. My particuler mentioning of your Church and you, was necessarie: being pleaded for by him that is now falling from us. If you think you have cause to be moved herewith, you cannot but think there was like cause offred us by you: Whiles you debarr aged Mr. P. from the Lords supper, (the greatest censure that you can lay upon him,) because he, being no member of your particular congregation but of the church of England, cometh sometime to hear Gods Word in our church. Yea more, Whiles you keep that Religious yong man I. S. from your communion, as is sayd, because he holdeth it in his judgement that he may hear us: though he told you he had never doen it, neyther purposed to doe it: yet for not promising absolutely not to doe it, he is sayd to be repelled. I suppose a man shal scarcely finde such measure at the hands of any Bishop, minister or court in England.

Wheras you take it I have doen you no good, but much evil and wrong: I have learned to bear such imputations with comfort because they are unjust. It is the best good, if men would so accept it, to have their aberrations manifested. Your church continueth one with the church of England: for proof, (besides the publick doctrine among you, which proclaimeth us for schismatiks, & the dayly profession which your mẽbers make), I report me to that charitable libell which C. Lawn, I. Fowler & others, with their penman, have printed among st you. There, in the title, they professe to be returned into the bosome of the Church of England their true mother. Now they suck the brests of your church, and in the bosome therof they most of them rest, and some of them have stood in election to beare office among you: so there will be found an unitie between the Daughter and Mother. And if we may blame men for returning to the one, (as our publick Writings yet unanswered doe prove:) then for the other, I assure my self, they will not be found innocent. And we in reproving the man who falling back unto you, professed to doe the like in the assemblies of England if he were there: have doen no wrong to you or them.

Wheras you desire me, according to my offer (as you say) to set downe

in Writing my reasons, &c. I answer, such offer I made you none, that I would set downe my reasons eyther in Word or Writing. It is you that call me into this feild, and in reason you should therfore give the first onsett. You had your choise to doe it by Word or Writing, I being ready to defend by eyther. Now you choose Writing, I accept it: if you had set down your reasons, I would have given you an answer unto them. But Whē We have published so many reasons, in that one book of our Apologie (besides others) yet unanswered: it is strange that you call for more. You need not want matter to work upon, out of that litle book: and our other imploymēts, litle need to be called away, to Write againe reasons unto particular persons, When We have set forth so many in publick. Yet now to satisfie your desire, I set you downe this.

That separation Which is onely from syn, and communion therewith, is of God, & is al goodmens dutie:

But our separation is onely from syn, and communion With syn:

Wherin We Were intangled in your mother church:

Therfore our separation is of God, &c.

The first proposition is proved by the ten Commandements, Which forbid all syn, Exod 20. and by the Apostles doctrine, which forbiddeth all communion With syn: Eph. 5. 11. 2. Cor. 6. 14. 15. :16. The second is proved thus. The things Which We have separated from, are;

1. An humane Leitourgie, translated out of the Popes masse-book, a read and dead service Which We Were constreyned to offer unto God, in sted of his spiritual worship: Wherin also We Were bound to observe many other Romish traditions: to keep holy dayes Which God never sanctified: to have the signe of the crosse, gossips, &c. With Baptisme: to kneel before bread and wine: to hear vaine, lying and apocryphal Iewish fables, read in the church in stead of Gods Word: With many other particular impieties. Against Which Leitourgie, We have set downe many reasons in our Apologie pag. 64. Posit. 9. and proofes of the severall branches therof, by scripture.

2. The matter of that church; Which Was not taken of Saincts onely, (which every Christian Church ought to be, as is proved in our Apolog. p. 44. posit 3. & confirmed by reasons from the scriptures,) but Was first gathered and still continueth of a mixed multitude and their

their seed: Wherof the most part Was Popish, profane and Wicked: Who With the rest, Were by humane lawes forced to be members of that church: as the publick Acts and moniments shew: and is further proved and manifested to be synfull, in Iustific. of Separat. pag. 89. 90. 91. and 459 460.

3. The form and order of that church, Which is not the order set of God, (as We shew in our Apolog. pag. 60. Posit. 8. and the reasons annexed to the first branch therof,) but the order left by the Pope, in parishes, dioceses, provinces, and all conjoyned in a national church With courts and governours according. Disproved in Iustif. of Separ. p. 195. 196. 197.

4. The ministerie of that church, both superiour or governing, With their courts and canons: and inferiour or servile: Which is not the ministerie appointed by Christ in Rom. 12. 1. Cor. 12. Eph. 4. but a strange hierarchie and ministerie derived from Rome. Against Which We have produced many scriptures and reasons yet unanswered, in our Apol. Conf. art. 29. 30. 31. 32. and after in pag. 46. posit. 5. and proofes of the later branches of the same. reat. of the Minist. against Mr. Hild. p. 98. --- 105.

From these and the like evils in that church, have We separated: not from any trueth or good thing that is in the same. With these synns We Were defiled, and could not but be defiled When We Walked With that Church. Whereupon the conclusion followeth, that our separation Was necessarie, is of God, and the dutie of every one that would obey God.

These things, Mr. Paget, have been long since by us published, and by none hitherto disproved: I allege them now as my proofs unto you to Warrant our separation, and do expect your answer to the particular reasons in the places cited, if you think good to controvert the cause With me, and Would have me to reply upon you It is needlesse to set down any other, or moe, til those be refuted.

Now to your particulars.

1. You require my reasons, against the use of the Lords prayer among you.

I answer, I have not layd this as a cause of refusing communion

with

with you: so you have no reason to require this of me. We hold it good and holy, to use a right any of the Lords prayers, or any words of scripture, or those or any of those petitions taught us in Mat. 6. or Luke 11. in the words of eyther Evangelist, or other words, as the Spirit of God (which helpeth us to pray, Rom. 8.) leadeth us to any of them. If thus you doe, I blame you not. But if after prayer by the Spirit, you read that part of scripture for a prayer, or say it over by rote, as is the fashion of many: that I approve not, it being neyther the intendement of Christ, nor practise of his Apostles, that I can finde: & I desire your proofs from Gods word for so using it. What our reasons are against that abuse, are to be seen in our Apologie in Posit. 9. thither I referr you. The chiefest thing that I mislike in you about prayer, is: that whereas in December last, Mr. H. your fellow minister taught you and your Church the truth openly, and condemned praying on books, as is reported: you received not the truth, but opposed it, and doe yet oppose it unto some among you, that are troubled therabout. It had been your own dutie to have taught the people how to serve God aright: but to resist the trueth when God offreth it by your own brethren, is an heavy syn. The discussing herof, will fall out upon your answer given to the reasons which before I referred you unto, in our Apologie, concerning prayer.

2. About the lawfulnes of your ministerie, that which I spake (as occasion then called me) was by way of inquirie: asking the man who is now declining unto you, whether you doe administer here, by vertue of that calling which you had of the Bishops of England or have renounced it. And seing he could not tell, I pray your self to say, whether you still have or approve of that ministerie which the Bishop gave you, and the oath or promise which you made to him, and do now administer wholly or in part by vertue therof: and upon your answer, I will shew you in my next, what I mislike in your ministerie, and upon what ground. Secondly, the man supposing you had a new ordination here by the Eldership of an other Church: we asked him warrant for it from God, which he could not shew. If therfore it be so with you, I desire your defense therof by the book of God: for I am yet ignorant, what authoritie the Eldership of one Church hath to make

make or ordeyn ministers in another: now that Apostels and all extraordinarie functions are ceased.

3. For your agreement with England, I have before shewed from the work printed amōg your selves, that the bosome of your church & of the Church of England is one: so the reasons before noted, which warrant our separation from England are a sufficient ground to keep us from you, til you bring a difference, and shew how you separate also.

4. For the Temple wherin you worship, which is as I take it, the Nunnes chappel, built for the worship of their bread-in-God and other idols: my reasons against your use of it, I referr you to see in our Apologie p. 75. Pos. 12. and the grounds from scriptures there alleaged.

Other things there are, wherin you know we differ from you: as your keeping of holy dayes besides the Lords dayes, and yet not half the holy dayes of the Church of England. Mariage a civil dutie, is performed by your ministerie in your Church. Your Eldership sitteth and judgeth matters apart from the congregation: and this your court I suppose wil finde no better allowance by the church or courts of England then doth our church, which you count schismatical. Of these things you may see your selves reproved and convicted in our Apologie aforesayd.

Finally, you shape your Church according to the time and place wherin you live. In England your people use the communion Book, keep such holy dayes, have such ceremonies, officers, courts, &c. as the law there commandeth: here you are of an other seeming forme, and use not the things which your mother church requireth. Now I hold, that the constitution, worship, ministerie, goverment, holy dayes of the Church should be uniforme, and not variable in every coast. But to the things by you propounded, I have given answer, and directed you to our reasons, which you may reply upon if you see cause. And if so you doe: as my leisure serveth me, (who am for the present imployed in other affaires, which I have undertaken with Gods help to performe with my most convenient speed,) I wil through Christes assistance mainteyn them against you. God guide you into the way of trueth and peace.

The 25. of the 7. Moneth. 1617.

Henr. Ainsworth.

Peace & truth from the Prince of Peace.

FOr answer unto your preface, I pray you consider, that The provocation I spake of, was of your people to me, & not to your self: Their provocation of me, togather with the signification of my readines thereupon to maintaine the lawfulnes of our communion against you, I supposed to have bene a sufficient cause of some thing passing betweene you & me though you thought otherwise as appeareth in your first writing: so that you needed not now in this second writing to have excused your self by such a provocation & soliciting of you, as I never mentioned nor implyed in my writing. But yet if provocations made unto you, and earnest solicitations of you be sufficient cause and calling for you to controvert, then have you cause and calling enough, being as I heare, so earnestly & so publiquely by the people of your owne Church mooved, and solicited to defend your owne opinion and practise against Mr. Robinson who hath in print reproved and condemned the same.

VVheras you confesse that by your general doctrine of separation we may freely take occasiō to deale, &c. you do therin also confesse that you are the provoker and beginner of controversie, which yet in your first writing you say you love not, and would still so faine remove the suspicion thereof from you. And if thus your general doctrine give such free occasion, how much more doth your speciall condemning of particular churches by name, occasion and provoke them to deale with you, though you think you had just reason so to do? I have not denyed neither do I deny but that our not admitting of such for membres of our congregation as would have liberty to heare in your Church as wel as ours, might be some occasion also to moove & provoke you to desire to deale with us likewise hereabouts; but yet so, that still you are to be held the first provokers who have first censured your people for comming to us and by

by name openly condemned our Church and ministery, long before we refused Mr. P. & I. Sh. vpon this late occasion.

As for I. Sh. that vnquiet & vnstable yong man he is not kept from our cōmunion, because he holdeth it in his judgemēt that he may hear you: his private judgement we would have allowed vnto him, so that he would have walked peaceably therein: but for his vnpeaceable walking & breach of promise he was refused by us: Besides conference with him for his conviction at divers times, there is also warrant and proofe of this our dealing with him, given unto him in writing and sent unto Mr. Brewer the speciall patrone of this halting practise & conversation, at whose vrgent and importunate provocation, the writing here of was first granted, & since that time he hath also a reply unto the answer which he wrote: If eyther they or you which cry out so lowd against our dealing, can refute the same, you have occasion enough and liberty to do it.

In the meame time I do onely ask this of you, whether you can with good conscience admit them for members of your Church, who do profess they wil hold their liberty to heare those whom they and you acknowledge to be in schisme, & vnjustly separate from the Church of Christ whereof they were members: for so do both aged Mr. P. and I. Sh. judge of you. If you answer, no: Then how can you with any equity exclaime against us for that thing wherein your self agree with us: as though *such measure* was offred by us as is *scarcely to be found at the hands of any Bp. minister or court in England*, when as yet the same measure is to be expected at your owne hand? If you answer, yea: that you would admit such: I doubt not but that your owne writings may justly be brought against you for your reproofe, & conviction herein.

As for the commendation of your owne patience, as *having learned to beare with comfort such imputations of wrong* as we complaine of: me thinkes you make too much hast vnto your owne praise: whether our patience in bearing with comfort your imputations of false Church, ministery and vnlawfull commu-

niō,&c. or your patiēce in bearing with comfort our complaints of wrong herein, be greater: let him that readeth judge upon the issue of your writing, when it appeares how that *best good of manifesting our aberrations* vnto us is performed by you.

For proofe that our Church continueth one with the church of England, you *report your self to the charitable libel which C. La, I. Fowler and others with their penman have printed, &c.* For answer hereunto I would have you to vnderstād, 1. *The principal penman or scribe of the separation that hath written most and purposely against the booke which you call a libel, hath long since acknowledged his fault for the same, & that vnder his hand in writing, acknowledging the great fruit, that comes by publishing the personall sins of them that continue in errour: And thus by his repentance hath made some satisfaction for his offence, as in due time is further to be manifested. 2. As for the other penmen which in their writings here and there have snatched at the same book: there is for them an answer in readines, to shew that they thē selves are extreemely guilty of that which they vnjustly impute unto others: and that the writings for their separation in respect of the manifold and horrible slanders conteyned therein, may indeed justly be noted, as most vncharitable Libels. 3. That part of the title obiected by you, viz *of returning into the bosome of the church of England their true Mother* with the words going before, as also those that go immediately before their names, are an addition foysted into the title by some falsifyer with out their consent or knowledge: and thus your maine hint and ground of proving our Church to be one with England, and consequently your devise to turne away the question from the state of our congregatiō vnto the Church of England & so to derive and direct all your arguments thitherward is but a weak shift and stands upon a mere forgery and therfore not to be admitted: If any aske how you should know of this falsification: I answer, thus much was signifyed heretofore unto you in that *Declaration* prefixed before the book writtē in defence of Mr. Brightmā against the vaine collections of *Io. de Cluse*

* Mr. Clifton teacher in Mr. Iohns. his company.

Cluse your Elder. Besides other falsifications there noted, they shew that the *title of their Booke is doubly encreased by the publisher*: & suppose it were doubtfull unto you, which part of the title was added, yet what godly wise man with out sinning against his cōscience could build such a pernicious consequence tending to the overthrow of a Church upon so doubtfull a coniecture? 4. Suppose those words had bene their owne, yea suppose they had in plaine words affirmed that which you would infer from thence, viz. that our Church continueth one with the Church of England, and that there is an vnity betwixt us, yet doth not this hinder, but that our Church is a distinct body from the Church of England: we are one with them in the doctrine of faith and salvation, and the members of our Church do not renounce the communion thereof but communicate with them as occasion is given: And thus much is also done by other Reformed Churches who disallow your course of separation, & embrace the bosome of the church of England, by entertayning communion there with as fully as we do, when occasion is givē: though both of us do testify against the corruptions thereof. They refuse not to suck the breasts of the Church of England, but profess to do the like in the assemblies of England, as that man doth whom you reprove for declining to vs.

VVhereas you deny your offer of setting downe your reasons either in word or writing, &c: I have these reasons out of your first writing to make me think otherwise. 1. I having signifyed my willingnes to confer with you *if you would set downe your reasons, &c.* the summe of your answer is. Nothing shall passe betwixt us except I be the first provoker, except I desire it, that then you would not refuse: In my second writing I desired it, and so perswaded my self you would have set downe your reasons. 2ly., you wrote and promised at first also that you would *not be wanting to do any good you could unto me*: therfore seing the setting downe of reasons is a meanes of doing some good, I perswaded my self you would do it if you could, when I desired the same. 3ly. You professed at first, that you were *mine*

in all Christian duetie: therfore seing it is one Christian duety to set downe our reasons for that which we hold the truth being desired of them whose we are, I did thence also perswade my self of this your kinde offer. You obiect now, it is I that called you into this field and should therfore in reason give the first onsett. I answer 1. It was I indeed that first desired the same, but being first provoked by your people and your self had just occasion so to do, as is shewed before: 2ly. My calling you into the field was not absolute and indefinite, but conditionall and limited after this manner *if you will take upon you to prove, &c. If you please to set downe in writing any arguments, &c. upon your large offer I am mooved to desire, &c. Having receaved your reasons I will endevour by my answer, &c.* Such a desire of conference as this is yeelds a quite contrary conclusion to that which you would draw from the same.

You complaine yet further, and think it *strange, that when you have published so many reasons in that one book of your Apologie (besides others) yet unanswered, we should call for more, &c.* Hereunto I answer: 1. A great number of the doctrines & reasons thereof conteyned in that book of your *Apology* are revoked by *Mr. Iohnson* himself the cheef Author thereof, as is by your self acknowledged & by* others recorded: & is it not thē a favour unto you to give you liberty & occasion to set downe your reasons againe more warily & circumspectly as you might see it expediēt, that you should not need to recant & refute them your self as the Author of this *Apology* hath done? For this I deserved rather thanks at your hands, then any blame. 2ly. many of those reasons in this *Apology* are also set downe very breefely & obscurely, not shewing clearely wherein stands the force of your collection frō the Scriptures there alleged, so that in this respect also, I had cause sufficient to desire you to set them downe againe to avoyd mistaking and trouble afterwards in the examination thereof. 3ly. The reasons written in your *Apology* are directed against thē Church of England and the ministery thereof: the reasons that I desired of you are such as you have for your separation from

* Profane Schis. of Bro. p. 79. 80.

from our particular Church and the ministery thereof. And who sees not then that for this regard especially I had reason to ask you for new reasons.

TO come now vnto your Syllogisme, I deny your 2d. proposition, viz. that your *separation is onely from sin*, &c. For prose of this you do alledge 4 thinges that you separate from, viz. an humane leiturgie, translated out of the Popes Masse-booke, &c. a mixed multitude forced to be members, &c. a Popish order in Parishes, dioceses, &c. and a strange hierarchie, &c. Hereunto I answer; First, suppose you did justly in separating from these 4. thinges, yet is not your minor proved, viz that your separation is *onely* from sin, and communion with sin: you do not separate *onely* from these things, but as you separate from these Dutch and French reformed Churches, as appeares both by the Example of *Iohn de Cluse* your Elder separating from the French Church, and by your doctrine in defence of him: so also do you separate from our Congregation, & censure those of your people that come unto us; this separation is not *onely* from sin, & therfore not of God, nor the duety of any good man, though you affirme it. As you are bound by your owne promise & expresse offer to deale with me *about what poynt or poynts I will*: So are you againe here bound by the cordes of your owne syllogisme, to prove your minor, that you separate from sin *onely*. If therfore you will deale either honestly and truely in respect of your promise, or soundly and directly in respect of your argument, you must shew us those sins which are just causes of forsaking our Church: For those 4. things above mentioned are not to be found in our Church.

Answ. 10 Th. wh. P. 59. 26.

Secondly, it is manifested unto you by *Mr. Robinson*, that *your separation is not onely frō evill:* but also from many good things in that you separate from private communion with the godly in England: For this cause he doth justly rebuke & reprove you as wanting* *Christian discretion*; For *confusion of judgement*. For *// unequall* dealing to the godly; For *// looking at them onely with the left eye:* For *ill-advisednes in throwing away all at a venture for some evilles*;

Relig. Comm. from pa. 1, to pag. 17. * pag. 6. // pag. 12. ° pag. 15. ° pag. 16.

evilles: For *destroying the vnity of the Spirit*: For your *debarring men from their Christian liberty*: & in summe for a dissembling & hypocriticall course *denying that indeed, which in word is profes-sed by you: as if one should deeme their frend a very honest man, but yet would neither trust him, nor have otherwise to deale with him for a farthing*. This separation is not onely from sin, & therfore not of God, nor the duety of any good men. Thus he shewes you how weake your second proposition is. For this he brings many arguments and refutes your reasons to the contrary. You profes in your first writing to me, that *you will not be wanting to defend any poynt of truth which God hath given you to see and witnesse, &c.* But what truth is in your profession? If you hold it for truth, why do you not labour to defend it being so justly called therevnto? If you see your errour why do not you acknowledge it, & give satisfaction vnto *Mr. Bernard* against whom you have vvitnessed *this poynt of private separation? But it appeares, that as you have confessed and affirmed, if private communion with the godly in England should be granted, the publicke would also follow, so you do yet still esteeme it the greatest pollicy that you can vse, to devoure and swallow vp the rebuke that *Mr. Robinson* hath layd vpon you, & to smother the matter, rather then by raking into it to rase the principles of your separation, and so to endanger your whole cause. But as your self do insult againt *Mr. Johns.* for his *tergiversation* in one poynt: so and much more justly may *Mr. Robinson.* triumph over you for your *tergiversation* in this matter, & say vnto you in your owne words: * *you wink and will not see it, you are mute & will not defend it, but wind away to other things, &c.*

*Counter-poy. p. 197.

⟨Nota.

*Animad-vers. to Mr. Cl. ad-vert. p. 60.

Thirdly, as for your separation from the publique estate and Communion with the Church of England: becaus you do so often boast of your bookes and reasons vnanswered, even 4. or 5. times repeating it in this one leafe, I can not omit to tell you, and to bring to your remembrance, that your errour about this publique communion also hath bene by sundry men refuted & this in divers treatises both written and printed with yet remaine

maine vnanswered: and as of old heretofore, so of later time, you may see, by the *Second Manuduction for Mr. Robinson: by the vnreasonablenes of the separation*: vvhere whiles Mr. Johns. (whom it most concerneth) doth hold his peace, it lyes next vpon you who have so oft sent vs vnto the treatise refuted, and are by name called vpon to defend the same if you could. Also by *A treatise* written in defence of Communion with the Church of England, one part whereof was so imperfectly published by Mr. B. and hath bene long in the hands of your Elder Mr. Th. These with sundry other both written and printed do remaine vnanswered. And by these it is manifested that your separation is not onely from sin, & communion therwith, and therfore not of God.

AT length you come vnto the particulars, where I expected you should have begun at first: & first, concerning the vse of the L. Prayer among vs: you say you have not layd this as a cause of refusing communion with vs: that therfore I have no reason to require this of you, &c. I answer, that in my first writing I did not require your reason for this absolutely, but conditionally, if you thought it a just cause of refusing our communion: and this also I did vpon occasion of the vvoman who professed that she was ttoubled about communion with vs even for this cause: when as in your answer to this first writing you took no exception against this particular more then the rest, signifying also that you were willing to deale with me about what poynt I would, when as I had nominated this before; I was there vpon mooved to desire your reasons about this poynt also: But if you now agree with vs herein, I am the more glad of it.

VVhereas you adde, *if after prayer by the Spirit, you reade that part of Scripture for a prayer, or say it over by rote, as is the fashiō of many: that you approve not, &c.* First, I desire you to explane what you meane by saying it over *by rote*: if you meane, saying of it without vnderstanding and feeling, this we also condemne as vvell as you: But if your meaning be according to

H. Barow his ſlanderous & vngodly aſſertion, where ſpeaking of concluding our prayers with the Lords prayer, he demãdeth thus: * *What can be more groſſe, Popiſh, Idolatrous, ſuperſtitious then this?* Or if your meaning be the ſame with the erroneous anſwer to Mr. VVhite concerning this queſtion where *the vſe of the Lords Prayer as a prayer* is ſo often impugned by you: Then all the reaſons alledged vnto that purpoſe in your *Apology* are inſufficient Our maner is as you cannot be ignorant ordinarily before or after every Sermon or both to conclude our prayers with the Lord prayer; after we have prayed by the help of the Spirit we perſwade our ſelves that we alſo conclude by the help of the ſame Spirit in this vſe of the Lord prayer: If you cal this, *ſaying it by rote* and hold it to be ſin and a worſhip not to be communicated with all, I pray you tell me plainely, and then I will (godwilling) in my next writing give anſwer vnto thoſe * 9 reaſons in your Apology wherevnto you refer me: for there is no foundnes or truth in any of them.

* Diſcov. pag. 73. * Inquiry pag. 23. 30 31. 85.

* Pag. 69. 70.

Secondly, ſuppoſe we ſhould ſay over the Lord prayer by *rote* even in that worſt ſenſe, with out vnderſtanding and feeling, ſo as none can without injury imagine of vs: though this ſhould be our greevous ſin, ſo to vtter it, yet ſhould it not be the ſin of the people that joyne with vs & therfore no juſt cauſe of refuſing cõmunion with vs: about this poynt onely is our queſtion, & what you ſay beſide the ſame is here impertinent.

You adde yet further; *The cheefeſt thing that I miſlike about prayer in you, is: that Whereas in December laſt, Mr. H. your fellow miniſter taught you and your Church the truth openly and condemned praying on books: as is reported; you receyved not the truth but oppoſed it, &c.* Herevnto I anſwer: 1. The report you heard is vntrue in reſpect of the time of Mr. Hu. his preaching with vs; it was not in December laſt, but a whole twelve-moneth before. 2. VVhereas he ſpoke ſome things ambiguouſly in his Sermon touching ſet formes of prayer, being ſpoken vnto thereof by me before witneſſes, he explaned himſelf thus, that he did not condemne publique ſet formes of prayer, but thoſe onely that did

did content themſelves therewith vſing no other prayer in private vnto God; he acknowledged that he had vſed the book of common prayer in England; and further that he had offred ſtil to read prayers out of the ſame book ſo that he might enjoy his liberty to preach: when he perceyved how ſome vnderſtood his Sermon as hath bene reported to you he complayned that he vvas miſtaken. 3. For the vſe vvhich you draw from this falſe ground, I may juſtly apply it vnto your ſelf in your owne vvords: *It had bene your owne duety to have taught the people* the doctrine of religious communion both publique and private; *But to reſiſt the truth when God offreth it by your owne brethren* partly by them of your owne congregation vvho have proteſted openly againſt your Separation and forſaken the ſame, partly by Mr. Robinſon, vvho hath written againſt it, this *is an heavy ſin.*

TOuching the ſecond particular, the lawfullnes of my miniſtery: you tell me of the inquiry that you now made about it of the man declining vnto vs, and here alſo you come your ſelf to enquire of me, whether I do adminiſter here by vertue of that calling which I had of the Biſhops of Englãd, or have renounced it. Herevnto I anſwer. 1. As *it is a ſnare for a man to devoure that which is holy: and after the vowes to make inquirie. Prov. 20. 25.* So is it folly & ſin in you firſt to condemne that which is lawfull, as it hath bene ſtill reported, that you dealt with my calling and miniſtery from time to time, & now after ſo many cenſures and ſentences of condemnation vvhich you have paſſed vpon your people that heard me, that you now at laſt come to make inquirie. 2. I anſwer you, that I do not at all adminiſter, neither in whole nor part, by vertue of that calling which I had in England, though not of the Biſhops: neither yet have I renounced the ſame. But as through out theſe Reformed Churches, he that is called from one congregation to an other doth adminiſter by vertue of his nevv calling and his former calling ceaſſeth, though vvith out renunciation: So is it vvith me. And this my calling I may vvell avouch to be much

much more free and lavvfull, then that your entrance of old or creeping into this office vvhich you novv execute.

Touching my ordination vvherein our Church vſed the help of the Dutch reformed Church of this City, you deſire my defence thereof by the book of God, profeſſing that *you are yet ignorant what authority the Elderſhip of one Church hath to make or ordeyne miniſters in an other: now that Apoſtles & all extraordinary functions are ceaſſed.* I anſwer firſt, ſuppoſe that there had bene ſuch an errour in my ordination, as you pretend, yet doth it not follovv that it is vnlavvfull for any to heare me: I require your proofes for ſuch a ſeparation: for concerning this ſeparation is our maine controverſy, and ſee that you vvinde not avvay from it.

Secondly, if you be yet ignorant concerning this poynt; then I exhort you evē in reſpect of your ignorance to take heed how you alledge either this or any other the like doubtfull matters for a ground of ſeparation from vs: leaſt you and your people be found to be of their number that // *ſpeak evill of the things vvhich they do not vnderſtand.* // 2. Pet. 2. 12.

Thirdly, to help your ignorance vvhich you confeſſe herein, I propound vnto you theſe reaſons from the book of God.

1. Either ordination is not ſimply neceſſary: or els the help of other Churches and Elderſhips may be ſought for & lavvfully vſed therein: for othervviſe Chriſt ſhould not faithfully & ſufficiently provide for the neceſſities of his Churches, ſeing many of them do vvant fit and able perſons to performe that work of ordination vvhich conſiſteth * principally in publique prayers and exhortations to be made both to officers and people touching their mutuall duetyes, impoſition of hands being but the outvvard ſigne of the charge impoſed by exhortation, and of the bleſsing impoſed by prayer: this for example may be ſeene in many Churches vvhich are in the Dorpes or villages here in theſe Netherlandes, vvhere though they be the true Churches of Ch. yet are there not fit and able perſons thus to conſecrate or ordeyne their miniſters as by ample teſtimony may

* Exo. 29. 1 35 Levit. 8. 1. 2. &c. Nub. 27. 18. 19. 23. Deut 31. 7 Act. 6. 6. & 13. 2. 3.

may be confirmed vnto you in ſundry particulars. The wiſedome and // faithfullnes of Ch. in his Fathers houſe vvill not ſtand with ſo ſtraite an order as you plead for. // Heb. 3. 2 Eſa. 5. 3 4.

2. If the Elderſhip of one congregation may help an other for the diſcerning and convincing of errours & hereſies in caſes of controverſy, as is both manifeſt by the * Scriptures, and alſo by your owne practiſe & confeſſion in // ſeeking and procuring the Elderſhip of that ſeparate company at Leyden to come & help you in your controverſy with Mr. *Johnſon*: then vvhy may not alſo one Church deſire the help of th'Elderſhip in an other for the conſecration of their miniſter, vvhiles they want fit perſons for the ſolemne & publique performing of that work: ſeing both theſe actions are alike holy and religious vvorkes, the ſervice of God, & ſervices of his Church one as well as the other? Is not this // a partiality to prefer one commandement before an other without any warrant? * Act. 15. 2 &c. // Animad. pag. 107 109. // 1. Tim. 5. 21.

3. The Deacons and vvidowes of one Church are to performe ſervice vnto an other, vvhen neede requires in // miniſtration vnto their outward vvants and neceſsities: vvhy may not the paſtours and teachers of one Church adminiſter the word of exhortation & doctrine in an other alſo, & as vvel in the buſines of ordination as of any other? or vvhy may any Church receyve help from the hand of a Deacon, rather then from the mouth of a teacher, that is in an other congregation? // Rom. 16 1. 1. Cor. 16. 3 & 2. Cor. 8. 19. 22. 24.

4. If thoſe that have the gift of Prophecy being out of office may interpret the Scriptures by occaſion in divers Churches as your ſelf do * acknowledge from *Act.* 13. 15. VVhy may not ſuch men vpon occaſion of ordination in the neceſſity of any Church apply their doctrines & exhortations to that purpoſe, & likewiſe call vpon the name of God at the ſame time for the ſanctification of the perſon ordeyned vnto that vvork vvherevnto he is called; & for a bleſsing of his miniſtery vnto that people. * Confeſſ. Art. 34.

5. If the members of one Church may lawfully receyve the Lords ſupper in an other vpon occaſion, as by your owne prac-

tiſe you do acknowledge: then vvhy may not the paſtours and teachers of one Church adminiſter he ſame alſo in an other vvhen need requireth, ſeing the // ſtate of people and miniſters doth conſiſt in an equal relation one to an other, and their actions of receyving & adminiſtring are mutual betwixt them? And if the Lords ſupper may thus be adminiſtred ſome time by the help of neighbour-miniſters, why not ordination alſo?

// Heb. 13. 17. 1. Theſ. 5. 12. Act. 20. 28

6. To conclude, for as much as particular Churches, though in reſpect of their particular covenants, they be diſtinct bodies, yet in reſpect of † their common faith are all members of the ſame * body, of the ſame // city, and the ſame // family and houſhold of God: this generall bond directeth them to performe al poſsible help to one an other in al the workes of *ædification, ſo far as they are not reſtrayned by ſome ſpeciall commandement of God. Now this act of ordeyning, conſecrating or ſanctifying a miniſter vnto his office being a vvork of edification, and no reſtraint being ſhewed out of the Scriptures to hinder a neighbour-miniſter from performing the ſame; it followes that the Churches vvhich want perſons apt to teach, like thell *little ſiſters that have no breaſts*, may in this buſines vſe the help of the miniſters in other Churches, who in like maner being entreated therevnto may performe the ſame in the name of the Church that deſireth their help.

† Tit. 1. 4. 2. Pet. 1. 1. * Eph. 1. 23 & 4. 4. // Eph. 2. 19. & 3. 15 * Iude 20. &c. // Cant. 8. 8 9.

3. TOuching our agreement with England and your inference of ſeparation from vs therevpon, I have before ſhewed you the vanity thereof, but becauſe you repeate it againe: I do againe further anſwer you. 1. vve are a diſtinct and ſeverall body from the Church of England, and are no more vnder the authority and governement of the prelates, then any of the Dutch or French Churches in theſe Countries are. The boſome of the Church of England is embraced by theſe Churches, and their boſome againe is open to the members of the Church of England as vvell as ours; And therfore you cannot without great partiality, in this reſpect refuſe our communion rather then theirs. 2. You have condemned the communion of our

of our Church, before the forged addition in the title of that booke ſo miſprinted (not among vs but in England,) was publiſhed: And therfore your former injury cannot be iuſtifyed by that which is done afterward. 3. You would have vs ſhew how far vve ſeparate: I anſwer, vve profeſs ſeparation from knowne evilles, but not from the Churches of Ch. for evilles among them: and for our ſelves, our covenant hath bene from the firſt eſtabliſhment of our Church vnto this preſent to ſerve the Lord in the Goſpell of his Sonne, ſo far as is revealed vnto vs.

4. TOuching the fourth particular, viz. our temple, vvhich you call *the Nunnes Chappell built for the worſhip of their breaden God and other Idolles*: I anſwer, firſt I cannot finde by enquiry that this is ſo as you take it: Thoſe which keep the evidences & charter of the foundation of this building affirme the contrary. And it is probable, conſidering that the ordinary devotions performed in many Monaſteries and Cloyſters, were not the vvorſhip of the breaden God, but other ſongs and prayers, it being vnlawfull for thoſe vvomen that lived alone to execute the Prieſts office in making a breaden God. Secondly, though it be vncertaine, vvhether this Chappel was built for the vvorſhip of the breaden God, yet doubt I not but that much Idolvvorſhip hath bene performed therein, & therfore I come to examine your reaſons againſt the vſe of ſuch places, having now the true vvorſhip of God exerciſed in them.

Your firſt reaſon againſt the place of our vvorſhip, is, * *becauſe the reteyning thereof in ſuch vſe is a breach of the ſecond commandement. Exod. 20. 4. 5. 6. with Deut. 12. 2. 3.* As for Iſay. 30. 22. I ſuppoſe you alledge it for an other particular which is not our queſtion. * Apol. pa. 76.

Herevnto I anſwer: firſt, that commandement, Deut. 12. is as I take it a temporary ordinance, part of Moſes Politie that is now abrogate and therfore not perpetuall nor binding vs in theſe times: For howſoever the equity thereof continue, teaching vs to deteſt Idolatry, yet doth it not binde vs in ſuch maner &

ner and by ſuch meanes to ſignify our deteſtation thereof, as it did them in Moſes time? For example: as God here cõmands to aboliſh Idolatrous places, ſo in the next ch. *Deut.* 13.12.---15. 16. 17. God commands to aboliſh not onely their places of worſhip, but alſo all their goods, their cattel and all the ſpoyle of the Idolatrous apoſtates and to burne the ſame with fire. The equity of this commandement leads vs to a great deteſtation of Idolatry and apoſtaſy: but who will ſay that it is to be declared by the very ſame meanes and maner of judgement in deſtroying ſuch things as are of neceſſary vſe? And yet according to your reaſoning from this place: the goods, cattell & treaſures of ſilver and Gold, even of thouſand thouſands of peoples at this day ſhould be avoyded as execrable things, and neither by changing, buying, ſelling, borowing or any other dealing to be medled with all.

Secondly, as God cõmands to deſtroy idolatrous places, ſo he commands to aboliſh their names, and not to reteyne them *Deut.* 12. 3. This commandement appeares hereby to be temporary and ceremoniall, becauſe now in the new Teſtament, we ſee that the names of divers Idolles have bene reteyned in the perſons therevpon denominate: as the name of *Mercurie, Venus, Phebe, Iupiter, Apollo, Fortuna*, that were heathniſh Idolles worſhipped for Gods and Goddeſſes and yet their names not aboliſhed in the Saints mentioned by the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 16.14. *Phil.* 2.25. *Rom.* 16.1. *Tit.* 3.13. *1 Cor.* 16.17.

Thirdly, this commandement for deſtroying Idolatrous places as it is not perpetuall for time, ſo alſo not vniverſal for the place; but expreſſely determined and reſtreyned to the *Land of Canaan*, to the Idolles of thoſe *nations which Iſrael ſhould poſſeſs*; from *that place* they were to be cut off, as is thriſe noted, in 3. verſes togather, *Deu.* 12.1.2.3. Even as God would have greater ſeverity and deteſtation to be manifeſted towards the Idolatours themſelves in Canaan, then to thoſe of other countries a far off, *Deut.* 20 16.---15.16.17. *Ioſh.* 9.6.7, &c.

Fourthly, ſeing meats ſacrificed to Idolles were as much polluted

luted as the places of their vvorſhip, & yet notwithſtanding may now lawfully be reteyned for our neceſſary vſe, *Pſ.* 24.1. *with* 1. *Cor.* 10.25.26.27, &c. VVhy not the temples alſo, contrary to the ceremony of old?

Fiftly, as God commands to aboliſh the high places of Canaan, ſo he doth as well command to aboliſh and conſume his owne holy things, when the Religious vſe of them ceaſed; for example he commands to burne the remainder of the Paſchal Lamb which they could not eat the ſame night, *Exod.* 12.10. as alſo the fleſh of the Ramme of conſecration with the bread thereof that remayned to the morning, *Exod.* 29. 34. And the like commandement was given for the fleſh of the peace offring, *Levit.* 7, 15, 19. The equity of theſe ordinances continueth for ever, teaching vs how to regard the holy things of God, not according to the common vſe of other things, but with a more high and pretious eſtimation of them: but we may not according to the letter of the ceremony and according to your reaſoning aboliſh them: for then the bread & wine that remaines over after the adminiſtration of the Lords ſupper ſhould ſtill be burnt, or otherwiſe aboliſhed.

Laſtly, there is not the like reaſon to aboliſh the buildings abuſed vnto Idolatry now, as the high places of old, becauſe God having then appoynted one onely place for ſacrifice, *Deut.* 12.5.6, &c. *Levit.* 17.3.4. Thoſe high places being for ſacrifice were to be deſtroyed, though no Idolatry had bene committed in them: but being polluted with the ſervice of Idolles, there was then double cauſe of their deſtruction, which is not now in theſe, while difference of place is taken away *Ioh.* 4 21.

Thus you may ſee though. *Deut.* 12.2.3. be compared with *Exod.* 20.4.5.6. Yet is there no ſtrength therein for the purpoſe intended.

Your ſecond reaſon is, *becauſe ſo long as they are continued, Antichriſt with his abhominations is not wholy baniſhed out of the land: as the Lord hath appoynted and wil effect in his time. Rev.* 17. 16. & 18.

2

& 18.11.12.13. &c. and 2 Theſ.2.8. With 2.Kin.10. 26. 27. 28.

Anſ. This argument is denyed : The three firſt allegations ſhew that Antichriſte ſhalbe conſumed , but they ſhew not that our temples are any of his abominations : the 4th. allegation is taken from the policy of Moſes that is now abrogate.

3. Your third reaſon againſt the places , is : *becauſe the conſecrating of them peculiarly to the Worſhip of God, now in the time of the Goſpell, hath no Warrant in the Word of God.*

Anſ. I grant this: but yet deny , that for the errour of their conſecration in former time, they muſt therfore of neceſſity be aboliſhed now.

4. Vnto your fourth reaſon. I anſwer ; though it was of old a part of Gods honour to be worſhipped in the place that he choſe and a part of his diſhonour to deſtroy the ſame : though it be a part of popiſh devotion to hallow places for Gods worſhip , and to put Religion in them: yet doth it not follow that he now requires the plucking downe of the ſame, ſeing there is a change of the Law *Heb.* 7. 12. The ſcriptures alledged do not prove the conſequence ; they are of like nature, and are already anſwered.

5. Your fift reaſon is , *becauſe the godly Princes are commended in the ſcriptures for being carefull to aboliſh falſe Worſhip and the monuments thereof.* 2.*Chro.*17.6. 2 *Kin.*18.4.*and* 23. 12.13.14.15.

Anſ. Thoſe Princes being vnder the policy of Moſes are commended for their obedience and practiſe agreeing therewith, but the Godly Princes of our times not being vnder the ſame rudiments, are not bound to imitate them herein; further then the equity before mentioned doth require.

6. Your ſixt reaſon for aboliſhing theſe places, is : *Becauſe this being done , the people are more eaſily perſwaded and drawne to the true Worſhip of God in Spirit and truth : Whereas otherwiſe they are ſtill nouriſhed in ſuperſtition, and have meanes to be entiſed dayly to more corruption. Gen. 35 . 2. 3. 4. 2 Kin. 18. 4. 2 Chron.* 34. *Chap. Act. 17. 23. and 19. 2 6. 27. Levit.* 13. *and* 14. *Chap. With Iude, 23.*

Anſw. That which belonged vnto the temporary diſpenſation

tion vnder Moſes being ſet apart , the generall equity of theſe Scriptures leades vs no further then to aboliſh ſuch monuments of ſuperſtition & corruption as have no neceſſary vſe, which may thus further appeare vnto vs.

1. If all monuments of ſuperſtition ſhould be aboliſhed like thoſe Idolles and earerings that were in Iaakobs private houſhold, Gen. 35.2. &c. Then an infinite number of private houſes ſhould have bene and ſtill ought to be raſed and demoliſhed, which yet we never read to have bene either commanded of God or practiſed of the Godly. Among the Iſraelites, their private houſes were polluted with Idolatry , and were nurſeryes of ſuperſtition as well as their publique high places: *Ioſh.24.23 Iudg.17. 4. Zeph. 1.5. With Deut. 27. 15.* The private houſes of the Moſchovites at this day , as thoſe that have ſeene do teſtify, are full of images, and the maner of thoſe that enter dayly into one an others houſes , is firſt to worſhip and bow downe vnto thoſe Idolles , before they may ſalute any man in the houſe. The private houſes of Papiſts without number are dayly hallowed and conſecrate after their maner for Idol-ſervice and private maſſes: And all theſe Idol-houſes are memorialles of Idolatry, ſerving to nouriſh ſupeſtition, and meanes to entiſe therevnto, are they therfore all to be plucked downe?

2. As for the braſen ſerpent, 2 King. 18, 4. It was of no neceſſary vſe, and therfore might wel be aboliſhed.

3. The high places , the groves , altars , images deſtroyed by Ioſias, 2 Chro. 34. were alſo of no neceſſary vſe: It doth not appeare that the highplaces were houſes meet to be cõverted vnto Synagognes for the people to meet in : but were altars in high mountaines and hilles : And therfore not vnfitly is *Bamah* , an high place, expounded by *Bomos*, an Altar.

4. The Altar at Athens Act. 17. and the Silver temples of Diana made by *Demetrius* and his fellowes Act. 19. were likewiſe things of no neceſſary vſe. But whiles I examine thoſe places that you refer me vnto , I there finde that an Idolatrous place is converted by the Apoſtle vnto the ſervice of God :

Act. 19. 9. 10. The Schoole of *Tyrannus* being as the reſt of the heathniſh ſchooles, the nurſeries of ſuperſtition, Idolatry, falſe worſhip, and pernicious opinions, concerning God, his worſhip, and the ſoveraigne happines of man, was yet after this vſed by *Paul* for a place of Gods worſhip, for a ſchoole of Religion to preach the Goſpell of Chriſte in the ſame. In ſuch ſchooles the Philoſophers and Poëts, the * Prophets of the Heathens did teach their Religions, and cald vpon the names of their falſe Gods: The Epheſians in ſpeciall were infamous for their curious and magical arts taught among them, who now // burnt their books being better inſtructed, and ſome of their Idolatrous */ Prieſts (ſo deemed by ſome) became frendes vnto Paul: vvith ſuch fruit and bleſsing of God was the Goſpell preached dayly in this place for two yeares togather.

* Tit. 1. 12
// Act. 19. 19.
*/ Aſiarchai Beza Annot. on Act 19. 31.

5. Your allegation of *Levitic. 13. and 14.* doth alſo lead me to remember the equity of of that Lavv of God, whereby he ordeyned that things polluted being of leſſe price ſhould be broken, but being of more worth were to be purged and ſo reteyned, *Levit. 11. 32. 33. and 6 28.* As the mercifull care of God for his people appeared herein even vnder the law: ſo much more vnder the Goſpel, this type is fulfilled vnto vs, and the bountifulnes of God in Chriſte is now enlarged abundantly by granting vs the neceſſary vſe both of things polluted with Idolatry, as alſo of ſuch things as were otherwiſe ceremonially vncleane.

6. If you will have memorialles of ſuperſtition though of neceſſary vſe to be abōliſhed, as being perſwaſions and entiſements to Idolatry, then how will you excuſe your ſelf that do not onely not aboliſh them, but erect them a new: and thoſe alſo of no neceſſary vſe: and not the monuments of them onely, but the very Idoles themſelves: and ſuch Antichriſtian Idols alſo as have diſhonoured God as much if not more then ever any did? You will aſk me what and where they be: I anſwer, in your */ book againſt Mr. Iohnſon, where with your Pen as with a pencill you have paynted that Popiſh

*/ Animadverſ. Pag. 61.

Popiſh Image of the Croſſe, and ſet it vp for Religious vſe foure times in one page, while you deſcribe out of Bellarmine the maner of Popiſh Ordination, to teach men the evill thereof. If now an ignorant Papiſt in reading and ſeing theſe Idolles in your booke ſhall come to bleſſe an Idoll in his heart: either to adore any one of thoſe Idols that you have formed, or ſome other ſigne of the croſſe which he remembreth vpon this occaſion; (for oft do ſuch things come to paſſe, and men ſtumble at the Goſpell it ſelf, and through their corruption are hardned in errour by reading ſound reaſons againſt the ſame:) how could you now cleare your ſelf in this caſe from the guilt imes of drawing men to Idolatry? when men ſtumble at the word of God or ſound reaſon brought from the ſame, their ſin is vpon their owne head onely: But if men ſtumble at thoſe deviſed kindes of inſtruction which have no warrant from God, then comes their ſin vpon the head of their inſtructours alſo. And thus is it with your kinde of inſtruction here; it hath no warrant from the Lord: VVhen he in his word cōdemnes the abhominations of *Molech, Chemoſh, Aſhtaroth, Baal, &c.* he doth not cauſe the Shapes and figures of theſe Idolles to be pourtrayed or painted before the eyes of men, as you have done with this Popiſh Idoll of the Croſſe: And therfore here is no excuſe left for you herein. Though ſome may have done this before you, yet will it help you litle, who neglecting the example of all the Churches of Chriſt in that which is good, do yet follow a few in that errour, which you would ſeeme moſt to condemne.

Your ſeventh reaſon is: *Becauſe the Lord hath promiſed a bleſſing to them which do reiect & aboliſh them, and threatned a curſe to the contrary: And ſo alſo hath performed indeed, Eſa 30. 22. 23, &c. Exod 20, 5. 6. 2 Chron. 17. Chap. and 31 20. 21. With 2 Chron. 21. 13. 14, & 24. 17--25. & 28. Chap.* 7.

Anſw. Suppoſe that every one of theſe Scriptures did ſpeak more peremtorily then they do for the reiecting and raſing the houſes polluted with Idolatry, yet ſeing they are all to be

vnderstood partly according to the state and condition of the old Testament, and partly according to the equity mentioned before with exception of necessary vse, they do not therfore reprove that vse of temples which we now have.

THus far for answer vnto the reasons in your Apologie. Herevnto I have thought it meet to annex three or foure reasons taken from your owne practise, that you might be further convinced and judged even of your owne selves:

First, whereas the blinde and obstinate Iewes are at this day a false Church without Christe and without true God, and their worship false and blasphemous: yet have you not refused, after your division and rent from *Mr. Iohnson* to meete togather for the service of God in the Idol-temple of the Iewes, where they had exercised their Idol-service before you. How comes it to be lawfull for you to assemble where the Iewes have served their God, and not for vs where the Papists have bene before vs?

* Animadverf. p. 38. //Counterpo. pag. 196.

Secondly, whereas you have reiected the ministery of Mr. Iohnsons company, as * *a new establisht Hierarchy*, and do elswhere condemne such ministers as // *Idols:* from hence it followeth that the place where they meet togather to fullfill their ministery was an Idol-temple; And yet even in that same place where those *Idol-ministers* met, you are now content to come and assemble togather, they being dispossest. VVhy may not that place *2 Kin. 18. 4.* be now vrged against you, as well as against others by you? VVhy is not that Idol-house broken downe as well as the brasen Serpent, &c.

* Phil. 4. 19. 20. 2 Tim. 1. 16. 2 Cor. 9, 12 13.

Thirdly, in that you allow your people, the members of your Church to receyve the almes of the Dutch, which is a sacrifice *Phil. 4. 18.* and this in the same place which you condemne as an Idol-temple; If you will also allow them, at the same time to blesse in the name of God those that distribute so mercifully vnto thē, according to the * duety of the godly poore: do ye not hereby allow the worship of God in Idol-temples as you call them?

The

The answers which you give vnto *Mr. White* concerning this matter are insufficient · for

1. VVhere you would have vs to // *put difference betweene the ordinary publique worship of the Church in such places, and the occasionall receyving of almes therein by the poore:* This difference cannot without manifest vntruth be affirmed or applyed vnto the matter in hand: for the distribution of this almes here spoken of is not *occasionall*, but an *ordinary* publique work of mercy performed at certaine set times; and as is the distribution so is the receyving thereof. // Inquiry, pag. 56.

2. You put difference *between the benevolence of a Church to the ministers or Saincts of Christe (which is the sacrifice spoken of Phil. 4. 18.) & the releef of a city given to the poore that dwell among them, be they of any Religion whatsoever, one or other.* But neither will this distinction help you, for not onely the benevolence given to the ministers or Saincts of Christe, but that also which is giv̄ to the poore of any Religion whatsoever, one or other is a service and * sacrifice of sweet odour pleasant and acceptable to God: and further this almes that we speak of, is not the releef of a City but cheefely the benevolence of a Church collected publiquely every Lords day in the congregation of the Saincts, with whom you communicate in their publique almes though not in publique prayers. * Heb. 13. 16. Gal. 6. 10. 2 Cor. 9. 13.

3. You put difference *betweene the solemn appoynted worship of God by the Church so assembled togather, and the private dueties of thankfulnes, of salutation, or the like.* But this distinction also cannot truely be applyed vnto this matter in hand, for the dueties of godly thankfullnes and blessing in the name of the Lord, which are and ought to be here performed, are not *private* dueties but publique even as is this almes that is alwayes publiquely administred in the presence of a great multitude assembled togather.

4. This question is asked by you; *doth he think we hold it not lawfull to walk vp & downe in the Idol temples, as they vse in Pawles at London, &c.* I answer, that in in Idol-temples, where Idol-service is

vice is still ordinarily performed, you cannot lawfully walk vp
Mat. 18. 7. and downe, as men vse to do in Powles. For woe is denounced to the man by whom scandalles do come. And I demand of you, whether you hold it lawfull for men so to have walked vp and downe in the house of Baal, and there to have receyved almes as your people do in these temples whereof we speak:

Fourthly, your owne staggering and waverings about this matter are worthy to be observed:

* Discov. pag. 133. 1. The doubting of *H. Barow*, who had writtē so perēptorily hereof, is recorded in that peece of paper which is pasted vpon the * margēt of his book over against the place where he had maintayned such a vehement detestation of them And that is there in part diminished touching the civil vse of them.

2. *Mr. Iohnsons* wavering is recorded in his book against *Mr. White*: His confession there noted by himself concerning
// Inquiry. pag. 66. the lawfull hearing in these temples, was that // *it should no trouble himself and for others he would therein perswade them the best he*
† pag. 57. ·/· pag. 79. *could*. And yet in the very same book both † before and ·/· after
* pag. 66. he doth againe write against them: In the very same * page before noted, he blames *Mr. White* for *changing and rechanging his faith and profession as if he thought he might dally with Religion at his pleasure*: with what honesty and modesty is this done, while the same book testifyes his owne changing, rechanging & changing againe ofter then he could impute to Mr. VVhite? And since that also, he hath of late tolerated sundry of his people to heare in those places.

// Iustific. pag. 443. 3. *Mr. Robinson*, though he have written in such high words against these tēples: that // *they are by lawfull authority to be demolished and overthrown: & in the meane while as execrable things to be avoyded by them which have none authority to deface or demolish*
* Pag. 441. *them*: though he plead against them, as being * *Idolles, vncleane things not to be touched: the mark of the beast not to be receyved: & aBabylon to be gone out of, &c.* Yet hath he for this long time tolerated *Mr. Br.* to heare the word of God in such places: and so according to his owne writing suffred one of his people to go into Babylon

Babylon, to cary the mark of the beast, and to be defiled with an Idol and an execrable thing, like an other Achan among them And not onely this, but now of late this last moneth as is witnessed vnto me, he seeing (as it appeares) how rashly and vnsoundly he hath written against Mr. Bernard in this poynt, begins openly in the middes of his congregation to plead for the lawfull vse of these temples; and so to repaire and build them vp againe, which before he would so faine have had to bene plucked downe.

4. For your self and your owne congregation; do you not know, and is it not confessed vnto you, that there is of your owne people that sometimes heare the Dutch-ministers even in these temples which you do so much condemne? doth not VV. S. profes that he vvil continue also thus to doe? And if this practise be a breach of the 2d. commandement, & a transgression of so many Scriptures as you alledg against it in your Apology: and if so heavy a curse be threatned against it as you there affirme, with what love of your brother or conscience of Christs ordinance, do you suffer that person to walke on in such an accursed course as you make it? or how can you without partiality make this a ground of refusing communion with vs, and yet tolerate it among your selves? Is this that *High-way of the vpright man* which you poynt at with your finger in the * sentence which you prefix before this your writing? Is this to * Prov. 16. 17. *keep your Way* and so to preserve your soule and the soules of those that you take charge of? Besides this, there are of your people that have holpen to repaire our temple and to make it fit for our vse, by mending and making new seates for the people and new pulpit for the minister in the same: and do they not hereby seeme to contradict your profession? I have here againe just cause to speak vnto you, as you did vnjustly vnto me vpon occasion of Mr. H. his Sermon: *The cheefest thing that I mislike in you about this matter*, is: that vvhereas *Mr. Iohnson & Mr. Robinson your fellow ministers have openly witnessed the truth* vnto you by their practise, yet *you do not receive the same, but oppose it*

poſe it ſtill. It had bene your duety to have layd aſide this errour of your ſelf, but to reſiſt the truth when God offreth it by your owne brethren, is an heavy ſin.

After theſe 4. particulars, you ſay, *Other things there are where in we know you differ from vs: as our keeping of holy dayes beſides the Lords dayes, &c. Mariage a civil duety performed by our miniſtery in our Church: Our Elderſhip ſitting and iudging matters apart from the congregation, &c.* Herevnto I anſwer.

Firſt, the queſtion betwixt vs, is not about all things wherein you differ from vs, but onely about thoſe differences which you hold to be juſt cauſes of renouncing our communion. Other great or greater differences then theſe, there are alſo betwixt vs: as that you allow not your people to mary with the members of the reformed Churches as we do, but make ſuch Mariages to be a cauſe of excommunicating your people, as though the godly mẽbers of theſe true Churches were like the abhominable Canaanites in your ſight: That you allow mariages made among your ſelves without conſent and authority of the Magiſtrates: and this both in England and here alſo, where the lawes do hold the Children of ſuch as are ſo maryed to be illegitimate: That you alſo allow divorces among your ſelves without the authority of the Magiſtrate: That you turne the Lords day into a ſeſsion or Court-day, omitting and thruſting out in part ſometimes the adminiſtration of the word & Sacraments, by ſpending ſo much time in controverſies & contentions: That you condemne the ſet maintenance of miniſters; with ſundry other differences, which I know not whether you maintaine as cauſes of ſeparation from vs. Theſe are yet in Compariſon your ſingle errours, vvhereas your ſeparation or ſchiſme is a double iniquity and an errour of errours: If in defence hereof you can prove our Church and miniſtery to be falſe, as hath bene oft avouched by you: you may then lay the axe of your ſeparation vnto the root of our Religion and hew vs downe at once: If you can ſhew our worſhip or place of worſhip to be vnlawfull, it would be ſomething

thing to the purpoſe: If you alledge other differences, and do not prove them to be cauſes of ſeparation, you wander from the queſtion.

Secondly, we knovv alſo that there are differences among your ſelves, both about ſome of theſe ſame, and other greater matters: and not onely betwixt you and *Mr. Robinſon*, but in your owne congregation alſo: as that ſome of your pẽople vpon the holy dayes by you mentioned, ſhut vp their ſhops: others not, as is * acknowledged by your ſelves vnto *Mr. White*: That ſome of you hold an enforced divorce, and that the *a* parties innocent either huſband or wife which forgive one an other being guilty of adultery and live ſtill togather are to be excommunicated; others holding the contrary: That ſome of your people are of your minde in denying private communion with the godly in England and yet ſome even of your owne congregation do allow ſuch communion, holding rather with *Mr. Robinſon* then with you, that refuſe to anſwer him: So that if notwithſtanding theſe and the like differences, you can yet hold communion among your ſelves, and with *Mr. Robinſon*, it may ſeeme that theſe three laſt differences above noted by you, are not intended as cauſes of ſeparation, and ſo belong not to our queſtion.

* Inquiry. p. 59 60.
a Ibid. p. 32 33.

Thirdly, our differing in thoſe 3 poynts nominated by you, is duely to be weighed of you: 1, *for keeping of holy dayes*: vve hold all dayes (except the Lords day) to be alike holy: If our people at the Magiſtrates appoyntment do ſhut vp their ſhops without putting holynes in the day, it is confeſſed that your people do the ſame alſo: That ordinary day of the week which we have for a ſermon is ſometimes changed vnto one of thoſe holy dayes (as they are called) and we preach on the ſame, to redeeme time for mens labour, and to win opportunity to preach the word vnto many in ſeaſon or out of ſeaſon; and this alſo, as I heare is done by you, and that by a memorable token at one time eſpecially; the time of your rending from *Mr.* Iohnſon being on a Chriſtmas day ſo called, vnto which day

you had changed the ordinary time of your assembling in the week. Thus far you agree with vs: & this being granted lawful, the rest if it be any thing will follow. 2. *For Mariages:* we do not hold it as a thing of necessity, that they should be celebrated by ministers in the Church; we judge them lawfull mariages that are made by the Magistrates without ministers: but yet vve hold it lawfull, more convenient, and comfortable that they be accomplished in the Church by the Ministers, both for shewing the dueties of the persons maryed and for obteyning a speciall blessing by the prayers of the congregation. 3. For *our Eldership sitting and judging matters, &c.* though our Eldership for the examination of parties and witnesses, and for their consultations thereabout do sit apart, as is meet; yet do we not exclude or debar any from hearing and seeing the conviction of any sin that is either publique of it self or persisted in, when they desire the same; yea we our selves have oft desired their presence to behold the convictions, admonitions and rebukes of offenders: and further, before any sentence be given for the cutting off of any offendour, we do first propound the matter vnto the whole Church, requiring their prayers, advise and consent without which never yet any judgement of excommunication hath bene executed against any amongst vs: And this also is propounded vnto them by divers degrees, long and oft before any pronouncing of sentence, that so our brethren may have sufficient time, both to informe themselves of the matter and to deliberate ripely thereof. And even this sitting of our Eldership apart from the congregation, seemes to have bene allowed by your self, for as much as in a matter of controversy, you and your Elder *Mr. Th.* have not refused to come & appeare before this our Eldership, and there to give what light & evidence you could vnto the matter in question; and thus also have others of your people at other times voluntarily come and appeared as witnesses before vs: and have so far communicated with our governement.

You say, *you suppose that this our court shall finde no better allowance by*

by the Church or Courts of England then doth your Church which we counte schismaticall. A vaine supposition: for 1. though our eldership should finde no favour nor allowance from the prelats or courts of England, yet have we comfort in Gods allowance: we depend on Christ and not vpon prelates. 2. The allowance of the reformed Churches which give vs the right hand of fellowship, being layd in ballance with the disallowance of prelates is enough to countervaile the same: A comfort that you are far from. 3. Even the cheef defendours of the prelacy can not but give allowance vnto our eldership, confessing that this governement [a] *may be admitted, and that it is as silver, good*; though they prefer their owne as Gold before the same.

[a] D. Downam, sermó at lambeth pag. 95.

You adde further, that *of these things we may see our selves reproved and convicted in your Apology aforesayd.* But this is also a vaine speech: first, there is no such conviction to be seene in your Apology; but this we rather see, that M^r. Johnson the Author of your Apology is in his conscience reproved & convicted of divers of these errours that he hath written: we see some of his people coming vnto our Sermons, even on those holy dayes you speak of: we see others of them willing and desirous to have their mariages celebrated in our congregation, even whiles they remaine with him still: we see his governement changed, but who knowes what it now is? we see him broken & confounded in his courses but without such true repentance, as should bring him plainely to confesse, to revoke & to refute his errours wherewith he hath bene a meanes to ensnare so many. And the sight of this confusion in him might be sufficient to serve for your iust reproofe also, if you consider it aright.

Secondly, suppose you had sufficiently convicted vs by your Apology in those differences betwixt vs, yet is not your refusall of our communion for the same iustifyed thereby; that is the question that remaines vnproved. VVhen I receyve any arguments from you to that purpose, I will then godwilling give answer both to those arguments for separation from vs, as also to so many reasons as I can finde in your Apology touching those

you had changed the ordinary time of your assembling in the week. Thus far you agree with vs: & this being granted lawful, the rest if it be any thing will follow. 2. *For Mariages:* we do not hold it as a thing of necessity, that they should be celebrated by ministers in the Church; we judge them lawfull mariages that are made by the Magistrates without ministers: but yet vve hold it lawfull, more convenient, and comfortable that they be accomplished in the Church by the Ministers, both for shewing the dueties of the persons maryed and for obteyning a speciall blessing by the prayers of the congregation. 3. For *our Eldership sitting and judging matters, &c.* though our Eldership for the examination of parties and witnesses, and for their consultations thereabout do sit apart, as is meet; yet do we not exclude or debar any from hearing and seeing the conviction of any sin that is either publique of it self or persisted in, when they desire the same; yea we our selves have oft desired their presence to behold the convictions, admonitions and rebukes of offenders: and further, before any sentence be given for the cutting off of any offendour, we do first propound the matter vnto the whole Church, requiring their prayers, advise and consent without which never yet any judgement of excommunication hath bene executed against any amongst vs: And this also is propounded vnto them by divers degrees, long and oft before any pronouncing of sentence, that so our brethren may have sufficient time, both to informe themselves of the matter and to deliberate ripely thereof. And even this sitting of our Eldership apart from the congregation, seemes to have bene allowed by your self; for as much as in a matter of controversy, you and your Elder *Mr. Th.* have not refused to come & appeare before this our Eldership, and there to give what light & evidence you could vnto the matter in question; and thus also have others of your people at other times voluntarily come and appeared as witnesses before vs: and have so far communicated with our governement.

You say, *you suppose that this our court shall finde no better allowance by*

by the Church or Courts of England then doth your Church which we counte schismaticall. A vaine supposition: for 1. though our eldership should finde no favour nor allowance from the prelats or courts of England, yet have we comfort in Gods allowance: we depend on Christ and not vpon prelates. 2. The allowance of the reformed Churches which give vs the right hand of fellowship, being layd in ballance with the disallowance of prelates is enough to countervaile the same: A comfort that you are far from. 3. Even the cheef defendours of the prelacy can not but give allowance vnto our eldership, confessing that this governement [a] *may be admitted, and that it is as silver, good*; though they prefer their owne as Gold before the same.

[a] D. Downam, sermó at lambeth pag. 95.

You adde further, that *of these things we may see our selves reproved and convicted in your Apology aforesayd.* But this is also a vaine speech: first, there is no such conviction to be seene in your Apology; but this we rather see, that M^r. Johnson the Author of your Apology is in his conscience reproved & convicted of divers of these errours that he hath written: we see some of his people coming vnto our Sermons, even on those holy dayes you speak of: we see others of them willing and desirous to have their mariages celebrated in our congregation, even whiles they remaine with him still: we see his governement changed, but who knowes what it now is? we see him broken & confounded in his courses but without such true repentance, as should bring him plainely to confesse, to revoke & to refute his errours wherewith he hath bene a meanes to ensnare so many. And the sight of this confusion in him might be sufficient to serve for your iust reproofe also, if you consider it aright.

Secondly, suppose you had sufficiently convicted vs by your Apology in those differences betwixt vs, yet is not your refusall of our communion for the same iustifyed thereby; that is the question that remaines vnproved. VVhen I receyve any arguments from you to that purpose, I will then godwilling give answer both to those arguments for separation from vs, as also to so many reasons as I can finde in your Apology touching those

three particulars them ſelves.

In fine, you tel vs, that *We ſhape our Church according to the time and place wherein We live, &c.* Touching this imputation of variablenes, I anſwer for my ſelf, that when I lived in England, I teſtifyed againſt the evilles which I conceyved to be in the order of that Chureh: and when I was called hither I reioyced to finde thoſe things that I had deſired before and this without variablenes. And the communion which we ſtill vpon occaſion hold with the Church of England, can no more deſtroy the truth of our Church, then it doth other reformed Churches which practiſe in like maner. But if you come to ſpeake of variablenes, and ſhaping a mans ſelf to the time and place, you give vs occaſion to remember your owne levity & ſcandall in this behalfe: But I ſpare you for this time.

To conclude, ſeing that beſides the common and generall motives which may binde vs to deale faithfully and conſcionably in all our wayes, we have at this preſent alſo the hand of God lying vpon the City where we live, and his deſtroying angell is come into our ſtreets: ſo that many fall both on the right hand and on the left, through the noyſome peſtilence that walketh in the dark and waſteth at noone day: let vs therfore ſo write as if the arrowes of th'almighty did ſtick faſt in vs: Let vs with all our might ſeek thoſe things that may ſerve for the ædification of the Church of God, with his praiſe and our peace therein: even ſo as if ech of our writings were to be ſealed with our preſent diſſolution. He vvhoſe name is counſellour & the mighty God guide vs herevnto: Farewell in the Lord.

Auguſt. 21. 1617. *Iohn Paget:*

Love

CHAP. I.

Love the trueth, and peace. Zach. 8. 19.

I Like Well of your counſel (Mr: Paget) in the concluſion of your writing, that We ſhould ſo menage our cauſes, as may moſt tend to the edification of Gods Church, With his praiſe and our peace therin: and through his grace (which I humbly crave,) I ſhall indedevour my ſelf hereunto. One meanes to further this, I take to be the abridging and if it may be, the quite cutting off of all leſſe needfull matters, and holding to the mayn differences: an other, that We diſcuſſe things by the Word of God, not of man. Hen. Ainſ.

So firſt to end the ſtrife about the provocation to this controverſie: for as much as ſundry Works are publiſhed on your ſide and ours, I held them ſufficient to ſhew vnto judicious Readers, that Would examine the ſcriptures and reaſons brought on eyther part, Where the trueth lyeth, and purpoſed therfore to Write no more this Way, vnleſſe further and more probable obiections were publickly brought againſt vs. And I turned the courſe of my ſtudies an other Way, as is open y to be ſeen. Neyther Would I take occaſion to meddle, though provoked by you and yours, more then by any other: as I ſhewed you in part, by inſtances of ſome that could not be admitted to the Lords ſupper With you, for that they heard the doctrine of our Church, or thought it lawfull onely (as Was ſayd,) though they never did it. This I yet think to be more ſeverity on your part againſt vs, then any Biſhop in England Would ſhew: how juſtly you may doe it, remaineth to be judged, When the differences between vs are diſcuſſed. And as for the provocation of our people, Wheron you inſiſt: I know it not: the man whom you named, denyed it to me before Witneſſes, and ſayd: ſome of yours Were the beginners of it, as he could prove. But now that you have taken ſuch an occaſion, and We are entred into theſe liſts, let vs proceed.

For the order of our proceſſe, Wheras you beginning With me, Would yet vrge me to ſet down my reaſons, When as you ſaw them in print: I leav it vnto judgment, how meet this Was. As you knew that the chief Author of our Apologie, had revoked ſome doctrines and reaſons therin: ſo you might have knowen that I and others, intereſſed in that book,

book, held to the things therin publiſhed. My large offer to yeild to any kinde of conference with you, at your requeſt ; was not intended, neyther ſhould be ſtreyned to any other then an orderly courſe. Yet I ſet you downe a mayn ground, as you deſired, and that I am content to follow.

But you except againſt my argument and reaſons confirming it in "our Apologie, that thoſe reaſons are directed againſt the Church of En- "gland and the miniſterie therof: the reaſons that you deſired of me, "were ſuch as I had for our ſeparation from your particular Church, and the miniſterie therof.

To which I anſwer: In that they are directed againſt the Church of England they are alſo againſt yours: for you were members of that Church, and guiltie of the ſynns reproved in my argument, as we our ſelves alſo were, whiles we continued among them. Now the remo- ving of your dwelling into an other land, removeth not your ſynns from you, nor you from them: it is your repentance onely, and faith in Chriſt, that can purge away your ſynns, Luke 13.3.5. Mar. 1.15. Pa- piſts that dwell here, in England or other where, belong to the Church of Rome, til they break off themſelves by repentance. Neyther doth the abſteyning from the practiſe clear the ſynner: for the guilt of Cains murder, cleaved vnto him all his dayes, becauſe he was not cleanſed by repentance and faith; although he never killed man more, after Abel. So though you here practiſe not the idolatries doen in England yet in that you have practiſed them, and not repented, your guiltines is vpon you. How much more then doe your ſynns remaine, which oppoſe and ſpeak evill of vs, privately, publickly and in print, for departing from the evils, wherein we ſometimes walked among them. More- over I manifeſted your vnion with the Church of England by the very title of that book publiſhed by your own proſelytes, which ſayth, they "are returned into the boſome of the Church of England their true Mo- ther. These words, with ſome other in the title, you diſclaime, as being foiſted in by ſome falſifier. Be it ſo, though I know not of it: yet the thing it ſelf you diſclaime not: ſo it may be true, though they wrote not thoſe words. * And Chr. Lawn, the firſt pretended Author of that book, is knowen to live in the boſome of that Church, according to the title.

* I pray you tel me in your next, in the name of your chur. whether

And

And what will you anſwer to other words conteined in the pam- phlet: as in Pag. 1. Where they ſay, they ſought to make a publick re- nunciation of their vnchriſtian ſeparation, which with vs they had vndertaken from all the Churches of Chriſt. Meant they not the Church of England here for one? Let the 3 Page teſtifie, where they ſay. Theſe things being proved, their ſeparation from England would herevpon appeare to be vnlawfull. Let the 7. p ſpeak, where one of "the cauſes of their excommunication, is for charging vs to be Schiſma- "tiks for our ſeparation from the Church of England. And in their anſwer to this article, p. 8, they deny it not, but refer to their proofs "in the copie of their charge. Finally, let vs ſee what they ſay in pag. 2. We did openly renounce our covenant and profeſſion of ſeparation, "which at our firſt entrance among them, we had made with them: we "renounced it as being a moſt abominable and profane thing. Will you "ſay that all theſe words were alſo foiſted in by ſome falſifier? If not, why ſeek you now to turn away the diſcuſsing of the reaſons of our ſe- paration from that Church of England, eſpecially conſidering what profeſsion we make in the preface to the Confeſsion of our faith, (prin- ted with our Apologie) of our agreeing with other Chriſtian refor- med Churches round about vs, (ſome of which we there name,) & of our ſeparation onely from the Antichriſtian Church of England for the cauſes there manifeſted. The covenant and profeſsion of ſeparation which they made with vs at their firſt entrance, was from the Church of England whereof we had been; not from any of the Reformed chur- ches whereof we had not been. Wherfore they returning vnto you, with this renunciation of their covenant: who would not now expect at your hands, a juſtification of the Church of England?

you deny that you continew in the bo- ſome of the church of England

But you deſired reaſons for our ſeparation from your particular Church. Whereas we rather might deſire the reaſons of your ſepara- tion from our particular Church. For, beſides that ſome of your mem- bers, were firſt members of vs: our Church is before yours, being through Gods mercie, ſeated and ſtabliſhed here firſt: and you coming after gathered a people, and erected a miniſterie in this Citie by vs; never communicating your purpoſe or proceedings with vs; nor deman- ding of vs the reaſons of our ſeparation; nor ſhewing wherein you

agreed

agreed with vs, or dissented from vs. If now one of vs must needs be counted separators from an other: I think indifferent men will judge, the separation must lye vpon your selves.

An answer to Preface-matters.

Peace and truth from the Prince of Peace.

Joh. Pag. Mr. Ainsworth, Had you observed your owne directions for performing the counsell which you so well liked of, then would you not have brought in such store of humane testimonies, and those of the worst sort, and them also in the worst maner, as you have done: then would you not have inserted so many lesse needfull matters, but have kept more closely vnto the maine differences. VVhen you speak of of *ending the strife about the provocation to this controversie*, you begin it a fresh by bringing such a reason of your silence, as serves for a strong provocation to deale against you: the summe of it is: there was so much written on both sides, as you *held sufficient to shew vnto judicious Readers where the truth lay, & therfore purposed to write no more this way, vnlesse more probable obiections were brought against you*: as if you should have sayd in triumph: All is wonne: Separation hath gotten the victory: all of judgement may see it: there is nothing of weight or worth, nothing so probably written against vs, that deserves any more answer, therfore I will rest. VVho is it that sees the separation clapping her wings & crowing on this maner, boasting against all the Churches of Christ, and against all the godly & learned Ministers and members of the same, but they may justly be mooved by such a provocation as this? VVhereas you tell vs of *turning the course of your studies an other way*: & that it may *openly be seen*: vve see indeed that you are about a new translation of the Bible with annotations vpon the same, but it vvere much better for you to turne back the course of your studies, to stay this work a while, and in the feare of God first to examine your separation more soundly then you have done, and so to free & cleare yourself of that errour and scandall which you have giv̄e to the hurt and greefe of many a soule. Vnlesse you take this course, one of these two things will follow: Either you must make an vncleane work, or have an vncleane conscience: for if in your annotations you expound the scriptures all along as you go, according to that vvhich you have done in your other former writings for the maintenance of separation, then shall you give many vncleane notes, and defile the holy scriptures & lead vnto schisme: if in all your annotations for winning credit vnto them you do conceale your meaning, and hide your opinion notwithstanding all opportunities given, what do you els but betray the supposed truth, when as in your account it is generally and vnjustly oppugned, and pollute your owne conscience with this vnfaithfull dealing?

As for your provocation by vs, in that we admit not such for members of our Church as would have liberty to heare your Sermons, I gave you answer in my former writing, which here you take no knowledge of. This is no good way, *to abridge* less needfull matters, by repeating and renewing vnjust complaints of hard dealing and omitting the answers given already thervnto. You refer the matter vnto judgement of the Readers, and ten times you appeale vnto them in this writing: I agree with you herein, onely I entreat the Readers to see what is vvritten before, and still to compare our vvritings diligently togather that they may see what is answered, and vvhat is omitted & passed by: And therfore also have I caused these writings to be published, that the reader might have them to judge by. As for the man by whom I vvas provoked; If he deny it novv, yet that impeacheth not the truth of my assertion, vvhiles I have sundry vvitnesses to confirme the same. And it skilles not so much, vvhat he novv saith of himself before vvitnes, as vvhat the former vvitnesses do testify of him and his speeches.

That I had cause enough to desire you to set downe your reasons for separating frō vs notvvithstāding those reasons already

printed in your Apologie, is plaine: for first, though I knew you and some of your people had not yet openly revoked them, yet seing Mr. Iohnson the cheefe Author thereof had begun to recall them and refute them also himself, it was no blame worthy matter in me herevpon to give you occasion to think more seriously of them, and to give you liberty of setting them downe more advisedly. My second reason noted also in my former writing, you touch not at all. You speak of streyning your offer beyond an orderly course, but you cannot affirme, much lesse prove that I have done so by you. Vnto my third defence of requiring your reasons for your separation from our particular Church and Ministery, because those in your Apology are directed against the Church of England and the ministery thereof & not against vs: you reply that because we have not repented for being members of the Church of England, therfore our sins remaine, and therfore the reasons directed against the Church of England, are against ours also. This want of repentance you do also alledge sundry times againe in the heart of your treatise, as your maine ground to prove the vnlawfullnes both of our Church & ministery & to maintaine your separation from the same: And there may you finde a full and large answer herevnto, chap. 4. and 6. to shew that you have cause to repent your self for such maner of reasoning against the Church of God.

VVhen as to make way for the turning of your argument from vs to the Church of England, you alledged the title of a book published against your schisme and the proselytes thereof, I shewed you that your allegation was a forgery, your excuse now is that *you knew not of it*: But I prevented this excuse before in my former writing and shewed you the insufficiency thereof, seing the matter was published vnto you that you might have knowne it, see before p. 8. & 9. Againe, you do here cite many places of that a booke, to shew that the publishers thereof did renounce their separation from the Church of England, &c. But what an idle and lost labour is this to keep such

a Profane schisme of Brow,

a doe

a doe for proofe of that which we all do so freely and dayly confess and professe before all, & I did also acknowledge in my former writing? Is this dealing agreeable to your pretence of abridging or quite cutting off all less needfull matters? what is less needfull then to be so large in proof of that which is not denyed? Nay yourself do here acknowledge for vs that we do not disclayme an vnion with the Church of England. Yet are you not content with this, but in the margent of your writing you pray me to tell you in the name of our Church *whether we deny that we continue in the bosome of the Church of England.* Though I told you plainely enough before e in my b former writing, if you had had eares to heare, yet to satisfy your needless importunitie, I answer you againe in the behalf of our church, that if you meane by living in the bosome of the Church to live vnder the ecclesiastical censure and governement of the Church, then do we not live in the bosome of the Church of England; but are here in these low countries a distinct body and Church from them: if you meane a reteyning of Christian cõmunion with them, in this sense we do remaine in the bosome of that Church of Christ, practising communion vpon all good occasion, and hold them guilty of schisme that refuse to do the like. But then you demand further herevpon, *Why do I now seek to turne away the discussing of the reasons of your separation from the Church of England? Who would not now expect at my hands a justification of the Church of England?* I answer, 1. There is no reason to expect at my hands in this present controversie, a discussing of all that I hold & practise; so might I enter into an hundred controversies at once, touching all the artickles of my faith and profession. 2. For the defence of the Church of England, there are many learned men that have already written sundry treatises and justifyed the lawfullnes of the communion therein against you, whereas there is none that hath written any book in defence of this particular Church whereof I am a minister: neither is any man so much bound herevnto as I am. 3. Even this question which I vndertake against you is not a turning

b See before pag. 8.

away, but a leading of you by degrees vnto communion with the Church of England: you know the plaineſt method of teaching is to proceed *a notioribus ad minus nota*, & I doubt not but you being cõvinced of your etrour in ſeparating from this particular congregatiõ, will thereby be prepared and holpẽ to diſcerne the errour of ſeparatiõ from the Church of England alſo.

Here you inſert yet a new reaſon why I ſhould rather diſcuſs the reaſons of your ſeparation from England namely, *conſidering what profeſſion you make in the preface to the confeſſion of your faith (printed with your Apologie) of your agreeing with other Chriſtian reformed Churches round about vs (ſome of which you there name) and of your ſeparation onely from the Antichriſtian Church of England, &c.* But, oh Mr. Ainſworth, what truth is there in theſe wordes? This your profeſſion here mentioned by you is a counterfaire profeſſion and moſt vntrue; If you ſeparate *onely* from the Antichriſtian Church of England, why do you even in this very writing maintaine the ſeparation of your Elder *Decluſe* from the *French* Church? why are not ſuch of your people as vnderſtand their language allowed to heare in their Churches? Yea why do you publiſh in print concerning the Dutch and French Churches in theſe countries, that for the members of your Church they cannot partake with them, no not in hearing the word *without declining and apoſtaſy from the truth which you have receyved.* In the beginning of your writing you prefix the ſaying of the Prophet, *Love the truth and peace*: but by this dealing you ſeeme to love falſhood & diſſembling more then truth; And now for this deceitfull dealing there is ſo much the more reaſon to lay out your ſeparation from other Churches as well as from England, that ſimple men may no more be beguiled by you.

Inquiry of Th. wh. Pag. 26.

One other needfull and weighty matter you will yet have to be conſidered, before you come to your argument, namely, that *you rather might have deſired the reaſons of our ſeparation from your particular church, for beſides that ſome of our mẽbers were firſt members of you, your Church is before ours, &c. & we coming after, gathered a prople and erected a miniſtery in this citie by you never communicating our purpoſe or proceedings with you, nor demanding of you reaſons of, &c.* Anſw. 1. The reaſon why we conſulted not with you at our firſt comming vnto this citie, was becauſe you had already before my coming declared your ſelves to be open adverſaries of the truth by diſclayming and renouncing the communion of all the Churches of Chriſt, to the great offence of the godly in our own countrie, as alſo of the godly Magiſtrates Miniſters and people in this citie, I ſaw by your writings what evill counſailours you were, and what perverſe reaſonings you vſed therein and how you contemned the adviſe of ſuch as had dealt with you and therfore thought it not meete to communicate our proceedings with you. 2. Our purpoſe & proceedings were cõmunicated with many learned miniſters Engliſh, Scottiſh, Dutch & Frẽch who gave vs counſaile & help in our endevours, ſo that we needed not to communicate our affaires with you. The hand of God was with vs: the Reformed churches gave vs the right hand of fellowſhip: the hãd of the Chriſtian Magiſtrates was with vs through the mercy of God that gave vs favour in their eyes & put it into their hearts to further our enterpriſe, ſo that at my comming hither, there was then firſt eſtabliſhed in this citie a lawfull congregation of the Engliſh, and then divers which had before left your Church & gone vnto the Dutch did from thence come & joyne themſelves to vs: & ſince that time many other of your people leaving your ſchiſme have come vnto vs, the Lord ſtill encreaſing his bleſſing vpon our labours. 3. Suppoſe here had bene in this city a lawfull Engliſh church before our comming hither, & that we had offended in not communicating our proceedings with the ſame, yet had not this fault bene like vnto your ſeparation; it is one thing to neglect the counſell of ſome godly men, an other to renounce communion of all true Churches. And yet ſee how you pleaſe and flatter yourſelf with opinion of other mens opinion touching you, in that you ſay; *If now one of vs, muſt needs be counted ſeparatours from an other, you think, indifferẽt*

men

men will judge, the separation must ly vpon vs.

CHAP. II.

Touching the Argument, of Separating from sin onely.

Hen. Ainsw. Now therfore I come to my argument which was this.

That separation which is onely from syn and communion therwith, is of God, and is all good mens dutie. But our separation is onely from syn and communion with syn, wherwith we were intangled in your mother Church. Therfore our separation is of God, &c. The first proposition confirmed by Exod. 20. Eph. 5. 11. 2 Cor. 6. 14. 15. 16. You except not against. The second I proved by shewing the four chief heads of synns, for and from which we separated: and referred you to the scriptures & reasons in our publick writings, for further manifestation.

You answer: First suppose we did justly in separating from these four things, yet is not our minor proved. Your reason is, 1. We separate from the Dutch and French Churches. 2. We separate also from your congregation: & this separation (you say) is not onely from syn, & therfore not of God, &c. Herevpō you labour to binde me by the coards of mine own syllogisme (as you speak) to prove my Minor: and you vrge my promise, and presse me, If I will deale honestly & truely, or soundly and directly, &c. as if you thought the very naming of these Churches would make me afrayd. But the Lord is with vs, and we will not fear what man can doe vnto vs.

First, consider I pray you, how soundly and directly your self do answer vnto those 4. heads of transgressiō, which I named: whē you neyther ingenuously grant them, nor take vpon you to convince them, but put a suppositiō onely: that if any inconvenience folow, you may hereafter turne the tenour of your speech, and say we did vnjustly in separating. Thus you will walk at large, and I must be bound in coards: I must prove directly, you may answer indirectly. It was exspected not onely by me, but by some even of your owne flock, that you would try your strength to prove vs schismatiks from the church of England; but loe,

loe, how you withdraw at the first. Wel, seing you say no more, we will take your suppositiō for a certaine trueth: and let him that readeth, judge in discretion, whether of vs dealeth more soundly and directly.

Secondly, to insnare our separation in syn, you bring no one word of the Law of God, wherby syn is to be a knowen; but allege the congregations of men. Which may, I grant, be a stombling block to the weak: but cannot perswade any wise conscience. It hath been the Papists common practise, when scriptures faile them, to dazel mens eyes with names of Church, councils, fathers, &c. But I would not have you to learn their wayes. To the Law and to the Testimonie, sayth the Lord: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them, Esai. 8. 20. a Rō. 3. 20

Thirdly, you have no more reason, (if so much) to say that We have separated from the Dutch Churches, then that they have separated from vs. For We being called of God, while we dwelt in England entred into covenant there, and became his Church and people: and so had equal right in Christ, his Gospel and ordinances, with all other Churches in the world. For came the Word of God to Dutch men onely came it not to the English also? We being thus established in Christ, b acknowledged the reformed Churches, (vpon the sight of their Cōfessions,) to be true Churches, & our brethrē in the Lord: & to their Universities we dedicate the Confession of our faith. And how doe they accept of vs? To let passe other things which I could mention, behold what your Disciples have published in their foresayd libell, pag. 21. thus. b Coūterp. p. 49. Answer to Th. VVhite. Pag. 25.

The testimonie of the Dutch Church concerning the Brownists.

When as they sent their messengers with some questions vnto the Dutch Eldership, they received this answer from them: That they did not acknowledge their assemblie, to be an ecclesiastical assemblie, or a lawfull Church. And when Mr. Iohnson and others of them, were instant to hear reasons of this answer from them: it was further answered: They would doe it, if they saw it needfull, or if they found any thing that was worthy of answer.

Now let these things testifie before any equal judges, whether the

separation be most on vs, or on them.

Fourthly, the instance of that one man that came vnto vs from the French Church, convinceth vs no more of synfull separation; then the Dutch Churches receiving sundry of such as had been our members, convinceth them.

Fiftly, the cause why Mr. Cluse left the French Church, being their synns in their publik worship of God, & administration to the church; as praying out of humane prescribed Leitourgies, and preaching from humane apocryphal Catechismes: Baptising such as are not in the covenant of Christ, and the like; which are condemned by Exod. 20. 4. 5. Deut. 12. 32. Esa. 29. 13. Mat. 15. 9. Gen. 17. It followeth necessarily vpon my former mayn argument (which you have not yet infringed) that he left them lawfully: and so as yet, you have proved no syn in our separation.

Sixtly, there is in him and vs no other blame to be found then in yow and yours: who professing (in your last writing) to separate from knowen evils: have gathered here an other Church, and doe receive such as separate from some evils in the Church of England. And why then condemne you vs, for receiving him that separated from knowen evils in the French Church?

" *Your second exception is, that we separate also from your congregation, and censure those of our people that come vnto you. I answer: first it is you that have made the separation, by gathering a new Church apart from vs, who were here a Church before you, as whileare I shewed. Secondly, we have just cause to censure such of ours as come vnto you, both for their schisme, in leaving the true Church whereof they were: and for their falling back into great evils, as the renouncing of their holy covenant and profession of separation which at their first entrance amongst vs they made with vs: they renounce it as* most abominable, *as the Libellers amongst you (which somtime in profession were of vs) have printed in their infamous book aforesayd, p. 2. & 7. Vnlesse therfore you can disprove our Church, and separation from the synns in the Church of England the censuring of them is just.*

Your 3. exception is, that we separate also from the private communion

munion of the Godly in England. To convince vs of syn herein, you bring no one word of God, but would presse vs with the writings of men. How vnworthy this is, of a man professing to teach religion, let the godly judge. In sted of proving this to be syn vpon vs, you would vrge me to answer that book written for private communion: thus you indevour to set vs at variance amongst our selves, whiles you may look on for advantage. And why I pray you, might not I as well vrge you to answer the things written in that book against publick communion, which you mainteine? or to answer D. Bilsons book of perpetuall government, bent directly against your presbyteries and Church government, which hath been many moe yeres in publick then this which you mention to me. Or Mr. Hookers 8. books of ecclesiastical politie, written to overthrow yours? Those last books haue turned many from your side to the Prelate: and where there is one of vs, there are a 1000. of you and moe, to make answer. As for me, if I would answer it, you and others take a course to hinder me, by such private controversies as you begin and prosequute with me. And having in hand an other necessary work (as is partly knowen in publick) besides my private writings to you and sundry others, you yet would lode me with more: shewing your self like an hard task-Maister, to lay so much work on me, and doe so litle your self.

But what need you vrge this, seing it is not to the matter in hand. For your former writings to me, were about Church communion: mine argument is also concerning the same. Now to ease your self, you come in with private communion: which the Author of the book you mention, plainly distinguisheth from Church communion: which he disproveth evidently in the same book, as you may see. And whereas you say I have affirmed, if private communion be granted, publick will also folovv: you are mistaken if you apply it to the Church of England: This I hold, that publick communion of such persons vvith vs vvill folow: but not our publick communion vvith their Church where so many grosse evils are practised. You insult therfore in vaine, as if this (if it were granted) vvould rase the principles of our separation, and as if I therfore refused to deale therwith. It is not possible that our principles of separation, vvhich is from

ſyn onely, and communion therwith, as I have ſhewed you, ſhould ever be ſhaken, ſo long as Gods Word endureth.

Now though I need ſay no more of this matter, ſeing you have ſayd nothing from the ſcriptures againſt vs: yet I Wil ſhew you What I judge of this doctrine. All private communion With the godly in England I deny not: ſuch as are come to that meaſure of grace, as that they are Worthy in Chriſt, to be received into the true viſible Church, in that eſtate: With them I hold it lawful to have private communion, even before they be joyned to the Church. But ſuch as for their Antichriſtian eſtate and Walking, are by the rules of Gods Word, debarred from admiſsion into the Church of Chriſt til they repent & leave their ſyn: With them I hold it not lawfull to have private communion, though ſome good things appeare to be in them, Which I Wil labour to cheriſh. And this is that Which I intend in my anſwer to M. Bernard, in that place of my Book Which you cite, and I never held other Wiſe. If you can prove ſyn in this doctrine, I Wil hear you, ſpeaking frō the Word of God: other authoritie I refuſe to be preſſed With. And When you have proved vs to ſyn herein, (if ever you be able:) then are you to begin a new With your Church eſtate, Which Will not at all be juſtified hereby.

Anſwer.

To. Pa. THeſe things being thus diſpatched, you com now to your argument & repeat it. I denyed your minor, which was, *that you ſeparated from ſin onely*, &c. I ſhewed the weaknes of your profe of it frō the inſufficiēt enumeratiō of thoſe things that you profeſſed to ſeparate frō: My firſt exception was, that as you ſeparated from the Dutch & French Churches ſo from ours alſo: mētioning your ſeparation frō the Dutch & French onely to illuſtrate your fact & your dealing with ours: This exception you devide into two, & reply many things with litle reaſon: And *firſt, you pray me to cōſider how ſoundly & directly I anſwer vnto thoſe 4. heads of tranſgreſsion, Which you named: When I neither ingenuouſly grant thē, nor take vpō me to convince them, &c.* Herevnto I anſwer.

Firſt, my anſwer vnto your argument is ſound and direct though I meddle not with thoſe 4. tranſgreſſions at all: It is enough

enough to ſhew the falſhood of any argument, if we ſhew any part of the firſt or ſecond propoſition to be falſe: and it is in the anſwerers choyſe to deny what he will: But you, as if you regarded not the lawes of learning and the rules of right reaſoning, do grudge this liberty vnto me and expoſtulate with me as if the opponent might preſcribe the anſwerer what to grant and what to deny. Doth not your argument of *ſeparating from ſin onely* fall manifeſtly vnto the ground, and the honour of it ly in the duſt, when I give you ſome inſtances wherein you cannot prove that you ſeparate from ſin onely? why do you then trifle about ſurmiſes of I know not what inconveniences? Oh, but you complaine, *that I Will Walk at liberty and you muſt be boūd in cords: you muſt prove directly, & I may anſwer indirectly.* But you are herein a very vnjuſt murmurer: & you are herein like vnto a Nigardly perſon who deſiring to ſeeme liberall makes proffer of ſome kindenes, where he thinkes it wil not be accepted: but ſeeing it accepted contrary to his expectation, then he repents and frets in himſelf and grumbles againſt the perſon that hath accepted his offer: did not you offer me to reaſon with me *of* a *What poynt or poynts I Would?* vvhy do you now grudge to performe it? have not you framed and faſhioned your argument your ſelf? why do you With ſuch an ill-wil proſequute it in order? If it be a paine vnto you that you are bound: it is but in the cords of your owne offer and of your owne argument: you muſt blame your ſelf for it. If I walk at liberty it is but in the plaine pathway of direct reaſoning: let men of learning judge. And why do you trifle about the expectation of it may be two or three of our people (which yet I know not of) that ſuppoſed the queſtion betwixt vs was otherwiſe then it is; as if I ſhould alter the ſtate of the queſtion layd downe betwixt vs, vpon ſuch a pretence? How vnjuſtly do you complaine that I *With draw at the firſt*? I withdraw not one inch from the queſtion layd downe plainely of purpoſe by my ſelf to avoyd ſuch cavils as theſe: But loe, it is you which ſpeaking of our b *entring into liſts*, which were deſcribed by me & approved by your

a Fol. 2. 3

b Pag. 35

ſelf do yet at the very firſt encounter ſtart aſide from theſe liſts or bounds into an other field, and at one ſkip leap out of Germany into England.

Secondly, to ſalve or to mitigate a litle the paine of your diſcontentment, if it may be, I doe plainely ſignify vnto you that my reſolution and purpoſe is (the Lord aſſiſting me with life & ſtrength) to deale with you about your ſeparation from the Church of England, and to manifeſt your errour and ſchiſme therein alſo, vvhen once this controverſy about our particular congregation ſhalbe finiſhed and ſufficiently diſcuſſed. In the meane time I think to hold vnto this, being ſo fit a preparation vnto the other.

In the next place you reply further, that *to enſnare your ſeparation in ſin, I bring no one vvord of the Law of God, vvhereby ſin is to be knowne, but alledge the congregations of men. That this may be a ſtumbling block to the weak, &c. a common practiſe of the Papiſts to dazel mens eyes, &c. To the law and to the teſtimony, &c.* I anſwer.

Firſt, it is a great wrong and an vtter perverting of my anſwer to ſay I alledge the congregations of men to enſnare you in ſin, as though I drew an argument from the authority of men to convince your errour. I make no argument there at all, but give anſwer vnto you, and there againe onely in a matter of fact I declare the maner of your ſeparation to be otherwiſe then you pretended in ſpeaking of your ſeparation from thoſe 4. heads of tranſgreſſion: there I ſhew that your ſeparation is not onely from thoſe 4. things, but alſo that as you ſeparate from the Dutch and French, ſo do you from ours, thereby to give you occaſion to make good your argument for the reiecting of our congregation, and ſo to come vnto the particulars concerning the ſame, in defence whereof I hope to manifeſt how much you have abuſed the ſcriptures.

Secondly, the blame vvhich you impute vnto me for the allegation of humane teſtimonies to dazel the eyes of men, &c. is juſtly to be returned vpon your owne head, who do ſo often cite them and call for them to be your witneſſes, even all ſorts of

of them, heathniſh, Popiſh, Iewiſh Authors, yea the very witches themſelves and the Spirits of divination. For example

1. For the allegations of heathens, ſee how needleſly you alledge them; when you ſhew vnto Mr. *Iohnſon* the diſproportion betwixt the common wealth and miniſters in the church, you content not your ſelf with the ſcriptures, but you [c] call for the teſtimony of *Cato* to reprove him. VVhen you tell him of æquivocating, and ſhew it to be a common practiſe of ſuch as would deceive, you [d] call for the vvitneſſe of Ariſtotle againſt him, &c.

[c] Animad. verſ. p. 15.
[d] Ibid. pag. 35.

For allegation of Popiſh witneſſes, you produce many of them in this writing, as Pope *Sylveſter*, *Helmoldus*, *Geroldus & Vrbannus*, & other fabulous writers to reprove our opinion and practiſe; you that ſo litle regard [e] *the harpers of mount Sion*, the harmonious voyce of the reformed Churches that witneſs againſt you, do not yet refuſe to alledge & bring againſt vs thoſe [f] croaking frogs, and vncleane Spirits that come out of the mouth of the beaſt.

[e] Rev. 14. 1. 2.
[f] Rev. 16. 13.

3. For Iewiſh writers, you produce them ſo often, both [g] againſt Mr. Iohnſon and alſo in this your writing, that all men may ſee, you do not onely go *to the law and to the teſtimony*, but to the Talmud & to the Rabbines, to the Infidel Iewes: though the [h] curſe of God be come vpon them to the full, their [i] eyes being blinded, the [k] Kingdome of God taken from them, and they [l] caſt into vtter darknes, yet would you light our candle at them that ſit in the ſhadow of death: yea you follow and imitate the vaineſt ſort of them, the *Cabaliſts* in their curious ſpeculations as in your *tranſlation of the Pſalmes*, where you ſhew that *Iſrael* is a name of power and principalitie, you note further that [m] *it may alſo be obſerved, how in this word ISRAEL are conteyned the firſt letters of the names of* Abraham *and of* Sarah *his wife; of* Iſaak *and* Rebekah *his wife: of* Iaakob *and of both his Wives* Leah *and* Rachel, *&c.* If this were a lawfull or tolerable obſervation, you might as well for the countēancing of your ſchiſme, make the like obſervation vpon the name of *Separation*, for in this

[g] Animadverſ. p 16. 17. &c.
[h] 1 Theſ. 2 16.
[i] Rom. 11. 10.
[k] Mat. 21. 43.
[l] Mat. 8. 12.
[m] Annotations on Pſ. 14. 7.

word

word, *SEPARATION* are also conteyned the first letters of the names of *Abraham* and of *Sarah* his VVife: of *Isaak* & *Rebekah* his vvife: of *Iaakob* and of *Rachel* his wife: you might likewise observe how in this word SEPARATION are also conteyned the initiall or first letters of the names of those[u] 7. Saints *Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas*, that had the honour to be the first Deacons of the new planted Christian Church in Ierusalem: yea you might yet further observe that not onely the first letters of the names of those 3. ancient patriarkes *Abraham*, *Isaak* and *Iaakob*, but also the first letters of the names of the 4. later patriarkes of new Churches Mr. *Iohnson*, Mr. *Smith*, Mr. *Ainsworth*, Mr. *Robinson* are in like maner conteyned in this word *SEPARATION*, with many other mysteries that by such kinde of collections might be drawne from the same. But o *what is the chaffe to the Wheate, saith the Lord?* what is p *hay and stubble* of such observations to the *Gold, Silver and precious stones* of faithfull doctrine? And what have the sincere ministers of Christ to do with such vnsound, Iewish and *Cabalistical* observations & annotations?

u Act. 5, 6.
o Ier. 23. 28.
p 1 Cor. 3. 12.

4. For your allegation of the testimony of witches or Spirits of divination, your fault herein also appeares to be very great.

1. In that you q alledge the Oracles of the *Sibylles*, women possessed and inspired by the Devil: herein you offend against your owne r allegation, *to the law and to the testimony*; and consider the s verse going before in the same chapter: *Should not a people enquire at their God, should they go from the living to the dead?* A man might as well and as lawfully t with Ahaziah that wicked King of Israel have sent to enquire at the Oracle of *Baalzebub* the God of *Ekron*, as have gone to the orackle of *Baalah-Sibylla*: whose testimony you bring vnto vs. Our Saviour in the dayes of his flesh on earth u rebuked the wicked Spirits for their testimony of him, & cōmanded them to hold their peace: Paul also was x greeved at the testimony of the mayd that had the Spirit of divination: but you on the contrary require the Spirit

q Coūterp. Pag 47. Animad. vers. p. 95.
r Esa. 8. 20
s Ibid. 19.
t 2 Kin. 1. 2. 3 4.-16
u Luk 4. 35 41.
x Act. 16. 17. 18.

Spirit of divination to speak vnto vs, and call vnto *Sibyll* that she may cry after vs with her testimony. 2. This allegation is so much the more vile, then the testimony of many other witches that wicked men seek vnto, in respect of the most filthy and abhominable maner whereby this wretched wight did both receive and vtter againe the inspiration of the vncleane Spirit, namely not by her mouth onely, but her belly being swollen, and she sitting vpon the sacred stoole or Tripos, then came the stinking Oracle from vnder or out of the stoole below. This kinde of impure divination is noted both in the y title which the scripture gives, vnto these miscreants, which signifyeth a bottle or blader in respect of that inspiratiō which makes their bellies as a blowne bladder: & by the z titles which other writers give them to signify their speaking out of their bellies: And this monstrous impurity is more largely described by sundry other witnesses and by some that are printed togather with that booke, from whence you alledge those oracles of *Sibylla*. VVherfore then should such vncleane stuffe be brought vnto Christian eares: and why do you *Mr. Ainsworth* adorne your writings with such excrements of vncleane and wicked Spirits? 3. It is sin to go vnto vvitches for any Silver or cattel or such like earthly goods when they are lost or stollen, but to go vnto a Spirit of divination to enquire for the truth of Religion when it is hidden, lost or obscured by the adversaries thereof, who do by their controversies as it were steale the same: this is yet a greater iniquitie, this is to make the father of lyes a guide vnto the truth, and to set Satan in Gods seate. 4. Many in their necessities, dangers and temptations go vnto vvisardes: for as you tell *Mr. Iohnson* when he alledgeth the opinion of *Mr. Iunius* for his cause: a *What will not men do for help in time of need?* Yet are not such excused thereby: for God is b all sufficient vnto his people. But how much more are they to blame that needlesly for wantonnes, pleasure or vaine ostentation do run vnto them, as you do vnto *Sibylla*? what needed you

y Ob, & Oboth. Lev. 19 31 & 20. 27.
z Engastrimuthoi. ventriloqui. The 70 interpreters in Levit. 19. 31, &c. Bar-schuma, the son of Swelling The Syriac translat. in Act. 13. 6. See Iunius there, & Anal. on Deut. 18. 11.
a Animad. vers. p. 98.
b Gen. 17. 1.

you to run to the Spirit of divination to prove c Antichriſte to be Belial, as though the ſcriptures did not ſhew it ſufficiently? How frivolous and idle à flouriſh do you make with the teſtimony of *Sibylla* in the d other place to give ſome colour vnto ſuch an expoſition of ſcripture, as even your ſelf in the next page do reiect as vncertaine if not falſe? How juſt is the e reproofe of *H. Barow* vpon you, when he inveigheth againſt thoſe that *fetch the ornaments of their ſtile and of their bookes from profane Writers* though it were but to *exemplify and illuſtrate* that which they ſayd? what would he have ſayd think you, if he had ſeene you paint and varniſh the margent of your bookes vvith ſuch allegations as theſe? 5. Thoſe vvritings, from whence you alledge the teſtimonies of *Sibylla* are even by the publiſher of that book himſelf in his preface manifeſted to be forged and counterfait things for the moſt part: Now it is ſin to ly of the Divel, why do you then alledge in the name of *Sibylla*, you know not what? How greedy are you of vaine allegations, that thus lick vp the crummes and fragments of *Sibyll*, & graſp after the ſhadow of a ſorcereſſe? Though ſome ancient writers have heretofore vſed the teſtimony of the Sibyls, againſt the pagans that worſhipped the divel, to convince them by their owne oracles, which then were not ſo counterfait and forged as now they are, yet have not you the like excuſe, that want the like occaſion for the vſe of them. Theſe things I have thought good to note the more largely (though many other evils might further be obſerved in theſe your allegations) becauſe, your maner ſtill is through out your writings to vpbrayd vs ſo much with that which your ſelf are more guilty of.

c Animad. verſ. p. 95.
d Counter-poy. p. 47.
e Refutatiõ of Diſſ. pag. 120.

In the third place, you reply that we *have no more reaſon (if ſo much to ſay that you have ſeparated from the Dutch Churches, then that they have ſeparated from you, &c.* I anſwer.

1. This doth not diminiſh the truth of my former anſwer; if you have ſeparated from the Dutch, then have you not ſeparated onely from thoſe 4. heads, mentioned in your argument.

2. Nei-

2. Neither doth this diminiſh your ſin, but encreaſe the ſame: for if the Dutch have alſo ſeparated from you, this might be an occaſion of repentance vnto you by making you to conſider your wayes more ſeriouſly, and ſo to finde out your ſcandal condemned by the word of God. And the Papiſts, Arians and Anabaptiſts may ſay as wel as you, that *the Dutch Churches have ſeparated from them as well as they have ſeparated from the Dutch.* And this ſerves for a further witneſſe againſt them.

3. If *the word of God came not to Dutch men onely*, as you ſay: then are you for this cheefly to be humbled that have made à ſeparation contrary to that word that came vnto you alſo. And though you acknowledged the Reformed Churches to be true Churches and did dedicate your Confeſſion vnto their vniverſities, yet when they ſaw your ſchiſme publiſhed therein, namely that f *all that wilbe ſaved are bound by Gods Commandement, with ſpeed to come forth of their Antichriſtian eſtate in the Church of England, &c.* VVhereby you condemned all the godly therein as being in a damnable eſtate, & excluded from ſalvation in that eſtate: when they ſaw many of your exceptiõs againſt the Church of England to be ſuch as did alſo neceſſarily lead vnto ſeparation from them, as well as from England, had they not reaſon to avoyd and beware of the new Diſciples of ſuch a ſeparation, as being an vnlawfull aſſemblie eſtabliſhed in Schiſme and not in Chriſte.

f Confeſſ. Art. 32.

4. For that which you alledge concerning their anſwering of your reaſons: namely, that *they would do it, if they ſaw it needfull, or if they found any thing that was worthy of anſwer.* Might they not have their reaſons ſo to anſwer? did they not diſcerne your contentious diſpoſition in other dealings before, as well as afterward, when the deputies both of Dutch and French churches dealing with your Elderſhip about the cauſe of Mr. Iohn Iohnſon to have ſtayd your paſtour from the excommunication of his Father if it might have bene, do yet g teſtify that *they could not get* a h *plaine or direct anſwer from you?* And if there were

g Profane Schiſme of Bro. p. 6c.
h Categoricum reſpõſum.

were nothing els, had they not some reason to ceasse reasoning with them that would not answer plainely and directly?

i Preface to D. B. sect. 6. Before answer to Mr. Iacob.

Lastly, as Mr. Iohnson himself writes that i *experience the mistresse of fooles* teacheth many things, so might the Dutch Eldership consider that the same schoole-mistresse might teach you that, which you would not learne of others; as they may also see it come to passe in Mr. Iohnson and the greatest part of your congregation who have now of themselves let fal many of those things for which they stood so eagerly against the Dutch heretofore.

Your fourth reply is, that *the instance of that one man that came vnto you from the French Church, convinceth you no more of sinfull Separation; then the Dutch Churches receyving sundry of such as had bene your members convinceth them.* I answer, this instance was not alledged as an argument to convince the vnlawfulnes and sin of your separation, but as an answer for matter of fact vnto your argument, to illustrate your fact in separating from our congregatiou as you do from the French: & thus it shewes as much as it was brought for: namely, that you do not separate onely from the 4. things mentioned by you.

In your fift reply, you tel vs 3. of the causes for which Mr. *Cluse* your Elder left the French Church, viz. their vse of *humane leitourgies, Catechisme, & baptising such as are not in the covenant of Christe, &c.* That for these sins *according to your maine argument he left them lawfully, &c.* I answer.

1. This story of your Elders separation is imperfectly set downe: In the examination of his fact, it were expedient the Reader should know the circumstances thereof, & how it began in a most pregnant and remarkable discontment: how it was concluded with shameful & false boasting: of these things I have ample testimonie from Mr. *La vigne* the ancient & reverend pastour of that French Church, delivered vnto me in the presence of their Eldership which in due time is further to be manifested.

2. For the causes of his separation, he alledged also the set

maintenance of their ministers: their meeting in Idol-temples: their suffring of the innocent partie to forgive the offendant that had committed adultery, and to live togather againe: their maner of exercising their discipline, &c. Touching Idol-tēples, he may learne by this writing in defence of our particular congregation that he had no cause to separate vpon such a pretēce: and as for the rest of the poynts suppose they were all sins as you would have them: yet doth it not follow according to your maine or meane argument, that therfore he should leave their Church: for he did not according to your argument separate *from sin onely*, but from all that was good amongst them: and left their whole communion. That being true which followeth in the defence of our Church, Decluse may hereby perceive that he hath cause to humble himself for his offence given vnto the French.

Lastly, you reply, *that there is in him & you, no other blame to be found then in me and ours, who professe to separate from knowne evilles, &c.* I answer, that there be two maine differences betwixt vs, which do make our estates to differ as far as East is from the VVest: 1, he and you in justifying of him, will have such things to be knowne evilles, as are not evill at all: to wit, set maintenance of ministers: vse of our temples: the innocent persons receyning of the repentant adulterer, &c. These we maintaine to be lawfull: 2. he & you in justifying of him, for pretended corruptions do vtterly renounce communion, & quite leave a true Church as he hath done: but we on the contrary do not leave communion of true Churches for corruptions & sins, according to his example, but onely abstaine from the practise of evil in our owne persons, and witnesse against it in others, still holding communion with the Churches of Christe.

Vnto my second exception (as you call it, though it be my first answer onely illustrated with your separation from the French Church mentioned before) you reply two things.

1. You say, *it is we that have made the separation by gathering a*

new Church a part from you, who were here a Church before vs. I answer, though it be true that we renounce your schisme & communion, yet doth not our gathering of a new Church apart from you, prove the same: for it may yet come to passe that there shalbe an other new English Church in this citie gathered apart from vs, and yet no separation, but a loving communion occasionally mainteyned betwixt vs, though we be here a church before them By such a reason as this you might prove that Mr. Robinson and his company separated from you at his first comming into this land, because they gathered a new church apart from you in the same citie, you being here a Church before them. 2. you say, you have *just cause to censure such of yours as come vnto vs both for their schisme* in leaving you: & *for their falling into great evilles, as the renouncing of their holy covenant and profession of separation, &c.* I answer, 1. You censure your people sometimes not onely for separating from you: and for renouncing their covenant with you, but even for hearing one Sermon with vs, and cutt them off if they make not publique repentance: yea though they heare vs at such a time when you have no exercise: And this is a full proofe of that poynt wherevnto I brought it, namely to shew the lamenes of your argument, in that you did not separate onely from those 4. things noted by you: but this fault you will not see nor acknowledge, though it be most palpable. 2. That your people ought to renounce their covenant made among you with profession of separation from the Church of England, it is already shewed in those treatises which I have nominated vnto you, which if they were duely weighed, the abhomination of your schisme might well be discerned notwithstanding all the libelles which you have spread abroad against the Church of God.

To my third exception, as you reckon it, touching your separation from the private communion of the godly in England, you reply many things on a heape: that *to convince you of sin, I bring no one word of God, but would presse you with the writings of men, &c.* Herevnto I answer.

First, touching your misreckoning: you deale with me as the Church of Rome in their Catechismes doth with the decalogue or 10, Commandements: when they leave out the second commandement which is against their Idolatry, yet to keep the number of ten, they divide the last commandement & make two of it: so when I gave you 3. answers to your argument, you leave out the last and omit it altogather, and yet keep the number by dividing the first and making two of it.

Secondly, when I sent you here to the writings of *Mr. Robinson* refuting your private schisme, do not I send you to the word of God and scriptures which he hath alledged, as is largely to be [a] seene? How often do you your self in your bookes send vs vnto the writings of *H. Barow, and Mr. Iohnson*, vpbrayding vs for not answering of them? yea and furthet to shew your blinde partialitie in this complaint, do not you your self in your former [b] writing send me vnto *Mr. Robinsons* booke to answer it: and why may not I as wel send you to the very same Author? Nay, not onely so, but you send me vnto such a booke of *Mr. Robinson* as himself doth begin to revoke publiquely as being vnsound in divers thinges, whereas I refer you vnto a later booke of his, made with riper deliberation, and in no part that I heare of, publiquely revoked. His booke which you send me vnto, being his *Iustification of separation*, is sick of King [c] *Iehorams* incurable disease, the guttes of it fall out day by day, yea he openly pluckes out some of the bowelles thereof with his owne hands: vnto this rotten book you refer me, & yet blame me that refer you vnto that which is more sound. What equity or honesty is there, in this dealing?

[a] Relig. Com. from p. 7. to 17.

[b] Pag. 4.

[c] Chro. 21. 15, 18, 19.

Thirdly, for the *setting of you at variance*, it is your selves that have done it, yea the Lord in his judgement hath done it: I onely wish that you would not smother the matter, but search conscionably for the truth: and so I doubt not but it would redound to the *advantage* of the truth, and of many poore soules insnared in your errour, yea and to your owne advantage

at the laſt, by being made an occaſion to finde out the evill of your ſchiſme.

Fourthly, for your now *vrging of me to anſwer* the things that concerne publique communion in this foreſayd book, do you not conſider that vpon the comming forth of this book, there was preſently publiſhed a *Manuduction* for Mr. Robinſon to lead him vnto publique communion, and this by the ſame perſon that had convinced his private ſeparation to be vnlawfull? Thoſe that do juſtly weigh thoſe *Manuductions* may thereby diſcerne his doctrine about publique communion layd downe in that booke, to be already refuted.

Fiftly, for your vrging of me to anſwer *D. Bilſons and Mr. Hookers* bookes, as wel as I vrge you to anſwer Mr. Robinſon: I anſwer, there is not the like reaſon. 1. There is no miniſter or learned man to anſwer Mr. Robinſon but onely you, *Mr. Iohnſon* being againſt you alſo in this and no proteſtant miniſter in the world that holds ſuch an vnchriſtian errour againſt private communion with the godly beſides your ſelf that I can heare of: whereas for the anſwer of D.B. and Mr. H. there are many more fit and meet then I am. 2. I were never provoked to anſwer theſe men, as you have bene openly in your owne congregation by your owne people deſired and vrged to anſwer *Mr. Robinſon.* 3. The ſubſtance of that which is in thoſe two mens bookes hath bene anſwered already in many writings: the ſubſtance of that which Mr Robinſon hath printed againſt your private Schiſme, hath not bene refuted by any that I ever heard of.

Sixtly, to that you ſay, *there be for on of you, a 1000. of vs & moe, to make anſwer, &c.* I anſwer, 1. Though vve be moe then you, yet ſeing you be ſuch men of might, and we but graſhoppers in your ſight: ſeing your people do ſo often take into their mouthes that ſaying of Moſes and apply it to themſelves againſt vs: *one ſhall chaſe a thouſand, and two put ten thouſand to flight:* according to this account your excellency is equivalent vnto our multitude. 2. If we be a 1000. to

Deut. 32. 30.

to one of you, yet it appeares that one of you have heretofore bene as ready to contend for the ſeparation, as a 1000. of vs have bene to ſtrive againſt it: one of you hath ſtird vp as much contention as a 1000. of vs. Heretofore when Mr. B. wrote a book againſt your ſchiſme, ech of you ſtrove to be on his back. Mr. *Smith* & Mr. *Robinſon* pleaded that they had ſpeciall right in the quarrel, and yet you prevented them both and ruſhed into the battel before them: Though then you three came againſt one, yet now when 3. of you are by name called vpon to defend the *vnreaſonablenes of your ſeparation*, in the a book ſo entitled: there is not one of you appeares: heretofore you were wont to ſnatch vp private letters, broken notes of Sermons and other writings & made ſeveral bookes againſt them, ſtill complayning (as even in your former writing) that you were not anſwered: why do you now begin to make a contrary complaint againſt me? It is your ſelf thay lay lode vpon your owne broad ſhoulders, by ſetting your hand with b Iſmael againſt every man in every Church of Chriſte.

a In the preface:

b Gen. 16. 12.

Seventhly, though my *writings to you were about Church communion, and your argument alſo concerne the ſame*, yet if in this your argument you bring ſuch a propoſition, the falſhood whereof may be manifeſted by conſideration of your private communion, is there not juſt occaſion to note the ſame? And howſoever you intended your ſpeech touching the inference of publique communion from private, (if it were ſo as you now interpret your ſelf) the diſcuſſing thereof betwixt you would vndoubtedly help to pluck downe the tower of your ſeparation. As for your preſumptuous affirmation, that *it is not poſſible that the principles of your ſeparation which is from ſin onely and communion therewith ſhould ever be ſhaken, ſo long as Gods word endureth*, it is but a puffe of the fleſh: and I would counſell you to beware of ſuch vaine confidence, which might moove the Lord to c ſmite you with hardnes of heart: yea ſuch preſumption is not onely a mooving cauſe, but alſo a meanes whereby that judgement of obduration is executed:

c Iam. 4. 6.

for many times when corrupt flesh hath spoken or written vainely & cõfidently, there is a vayle of preiudice & frowardnes spread over the heart thereby: a greater vnwillingnes to retract errour is wrought in the heart thereby, & mẽ come to say as Pilate did in an other case, [d] *That which I have written, I have written.* The word of God is infallible & endureth for ever, but your knowledge of that word is fallible: Those two may not be compared together: Your separation is built vpon the misvnderstanding of that word. VVhether you erre & pervert the word of God in making that to be sin which is not: and in making that to be separation from sin onely, which is also separation from good things, we are to consider by the examination of the particulars following for which you separate from vs.

[d] Ioh. 19. 22.

Lastly, when you profess to shew vs your judgement touching communion with the godly in England, you do wrap vp the matter so, that simple men may easily mistake you and be deceyved by you: you tell vs that you hold private communion with *such as are come to that measure of grace, as that they are worthy in Christe, to be receyved into the true visible Church*: but who be they, *Mr. Ainsworth*? is there any one person, man, vvoman, or Child, high or low, that is a member of the Church of England, and vses to heare the Sermons of the sincerest Minister of that Church whosoever, whom you judge to be worthy in Christe to be receyved into the true visible Church? name any one if you can: Nay I know you can not according to your profession name one; for according to the whole tenour of your vvritings, they are all and every one of them Antichristians, yea grosse Idolatours, carying the marke of the beast, and therfore all of them by you debarred from the Church of Christe, vntill they renounce that Church and every Minister thereof, separating as you have done. But yet you say, you will *labour to cherish the good things that appeare to be in them*: Now vvhat is your *cherishing* of them? you allow them not to heare the faithfullest Minister of the Land, which might cherish them: your self deny all religious communion vnto them even

even in private: you pronounce them all to be the Children of wrath and of the curse: and teach throughout your vvritings that there is no promise of Christe in his Gospell, no hope of salvation that belongs vnto them in this their estate: This is your *cherishing* of them? This your private schisme is confuted by *Mr. Robinson*: he presseth you vvith the vvord of God, vvith the scriptures and vvith divine authoritie, though you vvould faine have the reader to imagine otherwise, by calling for the vvord of God, &c. Vntill you have answered the scriptures and the reasons alledged by him, it is needlesse for me to bring any more. In the meane time I wil endevour to maintaine our Church-estate against you.

CHAP. III.

Touching the vse of the Lords prayer.

THe mayn argument for our Separation being thus established: I now come to the particulars. For the vse or abuse of the Lords prayer (so called) first I mentioned the reading of that part of scripture for a prayer: and with this you meddle not. Secondly I misliked the saying it over by rote, as is the fashion of many. To this you say, if I mean without vnderstanding and feeling, you condemne that also. I answer, I meane not that onely: for men may also read it, yea may read humane leitourgies with vnderstanding and feeling, and yet offend in so praying: other things are requisite to true prayer besides vnaerstanding and feeling. I mean therfore by rote, after the common manner, without book: when men having committed it to memorie, say it over for their prayer, after they have prayed by the spirit; as God inabled them.

Thirdly I granted a lawfull and holy vse of that or any other part of scripture in our prayers, as the Spirit of God leadeth us to any of them. You say, your manner is ordinarily before or after every Sermon, to conclude your prayers with the Lords prayer: after you have prayed by the help of the Spirit, you persuade your selves that you also conclude by the help of the same Spirit.

This your practiſe and perſwaſion I approve not: being perſwaded that our Lord intended not ſuch an vſe of that ſcripture. My reaſons I will ſhew, when you have given anſwer to thoſe things ſet downe in our Apologie, as you promiſe.

For Mr. H. his doctrine among you, that it ſhould be ambignous, *and his meaning to be againſt thoſe onely that contented themſelves with a ſet forme, and vſed no other in private, &c. I can goe no further then by report: others that heard him, ſay otherwiſe then you doe. I hear alſo that he continueth like doctrine ſtill where he teacheth, and privatly diſſwadeth from reading prayers in praying to God: and other reaſons (which I ſpare now to mention) move me to think otherwiſe then you write of him. And in ſpeech with my ſelf, about the ſame time, before two that came with him, he ſignified his diſlike of reading prayers, without any ſuch limitation as you allege. But if he taught as I heard it related, it was but the trueth: from which your contrary judgement ſwarveth. Which in one of the proofs of my former argument, if you had fallen into it, would have come to the trial.*

Anſwer.

YOur maine argument for ſeparation from ſin onely vvill then be eſtabliſhed vvhen you have proved all thoſe particular things vvhich you blame in vs, to be ſin: and that you ſeparate from them onely: vntill ſuch time, you do here in vaine flatter your ſelf that your *maine argument is eſtabliſhed:* The truth and force of that general reaſon depends vpon the particulars vvhich vve now come to examine. Touching our queſtion about the vſe or abuſe of the *Lords prayer*, you obſerve in the firſt place, how *you mentioned the reading of that part of ſcripture for a prayer:* and therevpon you note, that *With this I meddle not.* I anſwer, 1. The reaſon why I ſpoke not of *reading that prayer* out of the booke, vvas becauſe we do not in our Church ſo vſe to read it on a booke, but vtter it vvithout a booke as vve do the other part of our prayers going before:

Now

Now the queſtion layd downe before betwixt you and me at this time is touching the practiſe of our particular congregation: and therfore it is you rather that go beſide the queſtion in this your mentioning of it. 2. Seing the reading of it vpon a book and vttring of it for our prayer without a book are both of them actions of like nature: ſeing the reaſons in your apologie againſt our vſe of this prayer are expreſſely and indifferently directed as well againſt the reading of this prayer, as againſt the ſaying of it by rote, (as you call it:) and there is no thing that is there diſtinctly ſpoken more againſt the one then the other: when I then vndertooke to refute thoſe reaſons in your Apoligie, did I not therein alſo vndertake to maintaine the reading of that prayer againſt you? who ſees not now, that your firſt note in this place is but a trifeling obſervation. 3 I deſire the readers to looke back into the former part of our writings touching this poynt, both mine and yours: to compare them togather: and then to judge who it is that hath winked and paſſed by the evills obiected about this matter, and namely, beſide other thirgs the ſlanderous and vngodly aſſertion of H. Barow touching our vſe of the Lords prayer.

In the ſecond place, you explane your meaning of that phraſe of *ſaying by rote*, contrary to the common acception of the word, of ſaying it *not onely Without vnderſtanding and feeling, but of ſaying it after the common maner, Without booke, &c.* you grant that *men may alſo reade it, yea and other humane leitourgies With vnderſtanding and feeling, and yet offend in ſo praying*: your reaſon is; *other things are requiſite to true prayer beſides vnderſtanding and feeling*. But what are thoſe other things which cannot be reduced vnto theſe two? vnderſtanding conteyneth vnder it the knowledge of God, his wiſedome, power, love, truth and other attributes: his gracious covenant in Chriſte, his law, his workes, &c. Likewiſe the knowledge both of our neighbours eſtate and our owne, our ſins, miſeries, deliverances, &c. Vnder feeling joyned with knowledge, are comprehended the feeling of Gods mercy in Chriſte by a lively faith: the ſenſe of his glo-

rious comforts by a lively hope: the feeling of our neighbours estate by true love and compassion and joy for him: the feeling of our owne sins, miseries, basenes, by true and godly sorow, humilitie, &c. Herevpon I do thus reason against you from your owne grant: That prayer which is vttred with knowledge, faith, hope, love, humility, &c. is acceptable vnto God, & ought to be approved of Men. But the Lords prayer is by vs vttred with knowledge, faith, hope, love, humility, &c. Therfore it is acceptable to God, and ought to be approved. The first proposition is manifest from the [a] scriptures, that do allow such vse of prayer: The second proposition is granted by your self, in that you yeeld the Lords prayer may be sayd of vs with vnderstanding and feeling, seing those two graces do comprehend vnder them the rest above named which are required for the acceptation of our prayers.

[a] Ps. 25. 1. 2. Mark. 11. 24. 25. Ioh. 14. 13. Heb. 11. 4. Iam. 5. 15. 1 Tim. 1. 5. Ps. 145. 18.

In the third place, whereas speaking of the Lords prayer, you grant *a lawfull and holy vse of that or of any other part of scripture in our prayers, as the spirit of God leadeth vs vnto any of them:* you do here againe yeeld vs the whole question and as much as vve desire: for we require no other vse of the Lords prayer, then *as the spirit of God leadeth vs vnto it.* A Christian man ought to be led by the Spirit of God in all his other actions and conversation, as well as in prayer: vve hold also that as a Christian man of weak memorie and vnable to read having but two or three psalmes without book, may yet dayly and ordinarily sing the same vnto God early and late, as his prayers, praises and thanksgivings & herein worship God in the Spirit: that even so the Lords prayer may also be dayly vsed for our prayer and vvorshipp of God in the Spirit: seing we are no otherwise taught to [c] *pray with the Spirit* and with vnderstanding, then as we are taught *to sing with the Spirit* & with vnderstanding, which singing I think you will not deny but that it may be done in set words ordinarily.

[b] Rom. 8. 1 Gal. 5. 16. —25.

[c] 1 Cor. 14 15.

In the fourth place it is here to be observed that whereas in my former vvriting, I desired you to tell me plainely, whether you

you held our vse of the Lord prayer to be sin and *a worship to be communicated with all*: to this you answer not. VVhereas againe I answered you distinctly in the [d] same place, that the saying of this prayer by rote even in the worst sense without feeling and vnderstanding could be no warrant for the people to separate from vs, though it should be our sin so to vse it: to this also you give no reply but pass by it as if it had not bene written, though I was instant with you, and shewed that about this poynt onely our question was, &c. further whereas in your fotmer [e] writing you confesse that for the vse of the Lords prayer among vs, you have not layd it downe as a cause of refusing communion with vs, &c. If you be still of the same minde (as you have not yet declared the contrary though you have bene so earnestly mooved to declare your meaning herein) then may you plainely discerne your separation overthrowne hereby in respect of many of those causes that you do pretend for the same: for if our vse of the Lords prayers be vnlawful: if it be a transgression contrary to the word of God and to so many scriptures as you do alledge to impugne the same: then why do you not separate for it, as well as for other sins which you impute vnto vs? as you approve not other things among vs, so neither do you approve this; how can you without partiality give your self a dispensation to hold communion with vs not withstanding this sin, rather then others? as for example, when you do maintaine your Elder Iohn Decluse separating from the French Church for their baptising some Children which you hold ought not to be baptised, how could you have allowed him to have held communion with them vsing the Lords prayer in your judgement contrary to the scriptures as well as the former? so for other read prayers: for celebration of Mariages in the Church, and the like, how can you alledge them as causes of separation, rather then this saying of the Lords prayer by rote, as you speak? Suppose you hold th' other to be greater sins then this, yet vvill not that cleare you: for 1, a good conscience vvill take heed of being defiled [f] vvith lesser knowne

[d] Pag. 14.

[e] Pag. 4.

[f] Mat. 5. 19 & 23. 23. Ps. 119. 6. 128.

knowne ſins, and not vvith greater onely: if there be ſuch an vnevitable pollution by communicating vvith that worſhip where any knowne ſin is committed as your vvritings for ſeparation do perſwade men: how comes it that this abuſe of the Lords prayer doth not pollute as vvel as the reſt? 2, ſeing the abuſe of the more g holy thing is the greater ſin: if our vſe of the Lords prayer be a ſin, then muſt it needes in this regard be a greater ſin, then the vſe of other ſet formes of prayer written by men: in as much as it is a greater ſin to abuſe the vvords of Chriſt then the words of other men. 3, ſeing this abuſe of the Lords prayer (as you account it) is far more frequent then that baptiſing, and celebration of mariages which you alledge as cauſes of refuſing communion with the Reformed Churches, and ſeing that evilles f often committed do the more pollute: how can you but refuſe communion for this abuſe as vvel as for th' other? 4, ſeing in your maine argument layd downe before, you plead that ſeparation to be of God, which is from ſin onely and communion therewith, and yet will not ſeparate for this ſin of abuſing the Lords prayer, had you not need to acquit your ſelf vviſely herein, vnleſs you vvil have your maine foundation of ſeparation to be ſhaken in peeces?

g Exo. 20. 7 Numb. 4. 15.

h Eſa. 59. 12. Hoſ. 12. 1.

As for my promiſe which you mention, namely to anſvver your 9. reaſons in your Apologie, although my promiſe vvas made vpon ſuch a condition as is not by you performed, yet becauſe the anſvver therevnto may ſerve for further defence of our Church in the vſe of the Lords prayer, I have not refuſed the labour to ſet dovvne a refutation thereof, as follovveth.

Apologie.

Apol. p. 69. You plead that our vſe of the Lord prayer is vnlavvful. 1. *Becauſe Chriſtes doctrine there is, to teach vs to pray after this maner: Math. 6. 9. & is not, for our prayer, to reade or ſay over thoſe vvordes by rote, &c.*

ANS-

Anſwer.

Firſt, this reaſon is inconſequent: becauſe, though the maner and forme of true prayer be there taught by Chriſte, that hinders not, but the ſame words may be our prayer alſo: One and the ſame patterne or forme of a thing doth often ſerve both for preſent vſe in the work wherevnto it is intended, and for imitation to make the like: As a juſt weight or balance ſerves both for our preſent vſe to weigh with all, and alſo for a patterne to make an other like the ſame by it. So the *Lords prayer* ſerves for a patterne of true prayer, & alſo for our preſent vſe at any time to call vpon the name of the Lord with thoſe words.

Secondly, conſider well your owne practiſe in ſinging of Pſalmes, and you ſhall thereby diſcerne your errour in this kinde of reaſoning here vſed by you: In the 8. the 100, the 117. Pſalmes and other ſuch like, the holy Ghoſt doth teach vs *after what maner* we are to praiſe and glorify God: In the doctrine of them we have a *patterne and forme* of ſpirituall ſongs and Hymnes: and yet this hinders you not but that you vſe to read or ſay over by rote (as you call it) the very ſame words for your owne ſpirituall ſongs in the worſhip of God. See you not now hereby, that the ſame words may ſerve both for a rule and patterne after what maner we are to worſhip, and alſo for our worſhip of God in the vſe of the very ſame words without any change?

Thirdly, ſeing the a phraſes vſed by our Saviour are ſuch as ſerve ſufficiently to expreſſe the mindes of fathers & Schoolemaiſters, even then when they allow their Children and Schollers to rehearſe their leſſons verbatim, either in ſome formes of ſalutation, petition or the like: what reaſon have you to deny the common and ordinary ſignification of the phraſes, there being nothing either in theſe texts or any other to enforce a change of this ſenſe and meaning wherein they are vſed?

a Mat. 6. 9. Luk. 11. 2.

Apology.

2. *Becauſe both Mathew and Luke recording that forme of prayer*

given

given by Christ, they have not the same words, nor the same number of words every where, &c.

Answer.

VVe do not contend that the same words and number of words in the Lords prayer are alwayes precisely and of necessity to be vsed, but we hold that it is lawfull to vse them as our prayer, either with or without such changes as are to be noted in the Evangelists recording them. If we precisely follow Mathew, it is no offence to Luke: If we vse the words as they are in Luke, it is no offence against Mathew: If we vary in phrase from both of them, it may be without offence to either: our tenent is, that either the same words or to the same purpose may lawfully be vsed of vs. And therfore this reason is wholly beside the question.

Apology.

3. *Because all the circumstances in both the Evangelists do lead vs thus to understand it. As namely, that Christ there sheweth the right maner how to vse prayer, like as he doth for the right vse of almes & fasting: how to avoyd ambition, hypocrisie, babling, and the like therein: how also to come to God in prayer, as Children do to their parents, asking bread, an egge, fish, or the like: that is, making requests vnto God according to our particular wants, in faith, hope, love, &c. Math. 6. 1--18. Luk. 11. 1--13.*

Answer.

This argument is a mere assertion and most false, without any proofe. There is no circumstance in either of the Evangelists that leads vs to think we may not vse the Lords prayer as a prayer. It can not be shewed that this vse of it, doth make vs guilty of ambition, hypocrisy or babling: or that in this vse we can not come vnto God with feeling of our particular wants as Children do to their parents: or that in this vse of it there can not be the practise of faith, hope, love, &c. All this remaines to be proved, vntill which time this argument might well for shame have hidden his head, and pluckt in these hornes of slander by which it pusheth at all the Saincts in the Reformed Churches for their dayly publique & private vse of this prayer, shutting them vp vnder the condemnation of Ambitious persons, hypocrites, Bablers; as being without feeling of their particular wants: without faith, hope and love in their vse of this prayer. Such arguments as this agree fitly with the slanders of H. Barow, but cannot become any modest Christians.

Apology.

4. *Because the Apostles (who both knew and carefully followed the true meaning of Christ herein) did neither bynd themselves to these words, but prayed still as they had severall occasions, according to this rule (Act. 1. 24. 25. & 4. 24--30, &c.*

Answer.

First, though the Apostles did not binde themselves to these words, yet doth not this prove, that they never vsed the same as their prayer: they might pray according to their severall occasions, according to this rule, and yet with the words of the rule. The ministers of Christ do here vse to pray according to their severall occasions, and yet with the words of this prayer also.

Secondly, though we read not in their writings, that they did in expresse words teach men to say over the Lords prayer, yet we reade that by their example in their writings they did as much in teaching men other set formes of prayer in their salutations and valedictions: as appeares, *Rom. 1. 7. 1 Cor. 1. 3. 2 Cor. 1. 2. Gal. 1. 3. Eph. 1. 2. Phil. 1. 2. Col. 1. 2. 1 Thes. 1. 1. 2 Thes. 1. 2. Rom. 16. 23. 1 Cor. 16. 23. Phil. 4. 23. 1 Thes. 5. 28. 2 Thes. 3. 18.* At several times vvriting vpon divers occasions and vnto divers people, Paul yet (we see) vsed the same forme of prayer, & the same words: And this is al one as if he had so many times vsed the Lords prayer: for vvherfore should it be more vnlawfull to vse the Lords prayer often, then to vse these formes of words so often for his prayer.

Thirdly, though the Apostles taught men according to their necessities and occasions to shew their requests vnto God in all maner prayer and supplication in the spirit with giving of

thanks, with watchfullnes and perſeverance, yet this hinders not but that they might vſe the Lords prayer & other like ſet formes of prayer alſo: for the vſe of the Lords prayer as a prayer doth not deſtroy ſupplication in the Spirit, nor overthrow perſeverance in prayer. Think you not, that there are many ſervants of Chriſt vſing to conclude their prayers with the Lords prayer, that yet watch with all perſeverance to ſhew their requeſts vnto God in all maner prayer, as well as your ſelf, or any of your ſeparated people? Anſwer me plainely according to that light and feeling which is in your conſcience.

Apologie.

5. *Els alſo how ſaith the Apoſtle (ſpeaking of prayer in a ſtrange tongue) When thou bleſſeſt, how ſhall he that occupieth the place of the vnlearned ſay Amen, at thy giving of thankes ſeing he knoweth not what thou ſpeakeſt?* 1 Cor. 14.16. *For if they ſay over the words of this forme of prayer, might not ſome have anſwered: yes we know what he ſaith, it is the Pater noſter, the Lords prayer which we know aforehand, and therfore we can ſay Amen vnto it, though it be ſpoken in a ſtrange tongue.*

Anſwer.

Firſt, the Lords prayer might be vſed often as a prayer in the Church of Corinth, and yet the vnlearned among them not be able to ſay Amen vnto theſe that ſpake ſtrange languages of whom the Apoſtle here ſpeaketh: becauſe theſe men were extraordinary Prophets and did at ſome times by a ſpeciall gift ſpeak other tongues and ſtrange languages. And therfore the Apoſtle might have replyed againe to any vnlearned that ſhould have anſwered as you ſuppoſe and feigne: Nay, though the Lords prayer be vſed ordinarily among you, in your owne ſpeech, yet you know not what theſe extraordinary Prophets ſay, which come with new revelations in a ſtrange tongue vnto you and therfore you can not ſay Amen vnto their prayers: ſo that I have ſtill juſt cauſe to ſpeak againſt their prayers in a ſtrange tongue.

Secondly, ſuppoſe the Corinthian Prophets had ſometimes vſed

vſed the Lords prayer in a ſtrange tongue, yet this might have bene ſo ſeldome and at ſuch times that the vnlearned could not perceyve or vnderſtand the ſame: This ſeldome and rare vſe of it, though it might be a ſufficient teſtimony how lawfull they held it to be for their prayer, yet could it not be ſufficient to enable the vnlearned to ſay Amen vnto it.

Thirdly, ſuppoſe theſe extraordinary Prophets had ſo often & ordinarily vſed the Lords prayer in a ſtrange tongue, that all the vnlearned could have diſcerned when the Prophets repeated the ſame yet doth it not follow that they could in lawfull maner have ſayd Amen vnto it: Becauſe the lawfull and right ſaying of Amen, whereof the Apoſtle ſpeakes requires not onely a confuſed knowledge, that the Lords prayer is ſayd over at ſuch a time: but alſo a diſtinct vnderſtanding of the ſeverall words therein, that their hearts and affections might go along with him that vſed the ſame, and ſo at length in the concluſion ſignify and witneſſe their conſent by ſaying Amen vnto it.

Fourthly, it is to be obſerved how *H. Barow* though vpon a moſt abſurd pretence doth yet in a contrary extremity contradict this your Apologie: whiles he affirmeth touching our vſe of the Lords prayer, even in our mother-tongue: that *it doth not edify the whole congregation, ſo that they may all minde one thing, or ſay Amen.* If it be true which he ſaith, that men vſing it in their vulgar tongue, can not yet ſay Amen vnto it: how can it be true which your Apologie ſaith, that they which occupy the place of the vnlearned may ſay Amen vnto it; evē when it is vſed in a ſtrange tongue? Diſcov. P. 70. 73.

Fiftly, if the people can ſay Amen vnto the Lords prayer, when the words thereof are vſually ſayd over, as your Apologie here affirmeth: do you not hereby overthrow your owne aſſertion in denying our vſe of it? for can we ſay Amen vnto an vnlawfull prayer, which is not ſupplication in the Spirit; which is not made with feeling of our wants, in faith, hope, &c? Or if it be lawfull for the people to follow vs with their conſent, and with their Amen, in the vſe of this prayer, is it not as lawfull

for vs to go before them in the vse thereof? Thus may you see how your owne reasonings returne vpon your owne head.

Apology.

6. *If Christ have commanded to vse those words in that number and order, then all such do sin as pray at any time and vse not those words, for he saith, when ye pray, say, &c.* Luk. 11. 2. *And the words* when ye pray *shew that this commandement is to be observed at all times: And then the Apostles sinned which prayed and vsed not these words.* Mat. 14. 30. &c.

Answer.

This argument, which is so much and so often stood vpon in b your writings, at least in six severall bookes, is also with the rest most weak and frivolous, for

b Discov. p. 70. 71. Inquir. pag. 85. Answer to M. Carp. pag. 24. Iust. of Separ. p. 471. Answer to Mr. Hild. pag. 140.

First, though Christes commandement of this prayer do include an allowãce of the vse of those very wordes & in the same number & order that either Mathew or Luke have recorded. yet doth it not follow, that we are therfore tyed to thẽ alone, & that all other prayers are excluded thereby. Common vse of speech teacheth vs to make an other construction of his wordes: for as a man that sends his Servant on a message, and commandes him when he comes vnto his friend to speak *on this maner* and to *say*, &c. doth thereby ordinarily warrant him either to deliver the same words verbatim, or els the same matter and substance of the message though with some change and variety of words and phrases. And as it were then a strange thing that he should be accounted a disobedient and vnfaithfull servant that should vse the very words of his maister without any change at all: so is it with the commandements of Christe. For example: Christ sending his Apostles and commanding them a forme of prayer for salutation, when they came into any house, to say, *Peace be to this house*, doth thereby warrant them either to vse the same words verbatim, or the same in substance: And either way his commandement was fulfilled. The holy Ghost prescribing a forme of praise to say alwayes, *The Lord be praysed*, doth allow vs either the very same vvords or such as are equivalent vnto

Luk. 10. 5.

Psa. 40. 16.

vnto them. And even so for the vse of the Lords prayer, our Saviour appoynts either the same words for our prayer, or such as tend to the same purpose: and both wayes is his commandement fulfilled.

Secondly, as for that particle *hótan*, *when*, which you do so much vrge against vs; it is not in the vse thereof so generall, nor so absolutely and largely extended vnto all times, as you vvould persvade vs: for example, Christ saith c *When* the vncleane Spirit goes forth, &c. *when* he comes againe, he findes the house empty, &c. d *Whẽ* ye see a cloud rising out of the west, straight way ye say a showre cometh & so it is. e *when* thou makest a feast call not thy frends, &c. But *when* thou makest a feast call the poore, the maimed, &c. Now sometimes the vncleane Spirits were cast out and returned not: sometimes there are cloudes out of the vvest without raine: sometimes men may invite to feasts their frends, brethren and rich neighbours. And therfore though our Saviour had also sayd, *when ye pray, vse these phrases and these very words for your prayers:* &c. yet had he not thereby absolutely tyed vs vnto them alone, and excluded all other: for the word *hótan* doth oft note vnto vs as much as *sometimes* or *for the most part* as is evident in these instances & might also be shewed in many more such like.

c Luk 11. 24. 25. 26.
d Luk 12, 54.
e Luk. 14. 12. 13.

This answer may also suffice for that other part of your obiection, touching the excluding of all prayer in the Spirit alone that is without words or distinct voyce.

Apologie.

7. *Because that forme of prayer doth plainely and fully direct & restraine our ignorant and inordinate desires, vnto certaine heads: in which whatsoever is needfull and lawfull to ask, &c.*

Answer.

I may say of these your reasons and consequences as your self once f wrote to *Mr. Smith*: *The prayer* of David seemes to have prevayled against you, for g *when you shoote arrowes they are as broken: or like vnto strawes:* so weak and vaine they are, for.

f Defens. of Script. pag. 92.
g Ps. 58. 7.

First though all things needfull or lawfull to be asked, be con-

conteyned in the heads of this prayer: though thousands of petitions are and may be derived by the Children of God according to their severall wants, times & occasions from ech of these heads: yet doth it not follow that the words of this prayer themselves may not be vsed by vs for our prayer: here is no proofe of this consequence.

Secondly, whereas you say: *The heads themselves are so generall as no man can well for himself or others vse them aright without some speciall relation or application to his or their particular estate or occasions*: This is both false and inconsequent: 1. This is false, for even in a generall respect and love of Gods name, kingdom and will, we may well and lawfully vse the words of this prayer, though for the present our thoughts doe not light and settle vpon the consideration of the particular meanes and wayes, whereby his name is sanctifyed, his will accomplished, &c. As the elect Angelles do evermore behold the face of God & present themselves before him, wayting with reverence and with a generall respect vnto his will before they receive any particular or speciall commandements or commissions from him: so do the godly in the vse of this prayer offer themselves to God: and so are they taught to do even by the words of this prayer it self, *Mat. 6. 10.* againe we may well and comfortably vse the vvords of this prayer with a generall respect of our sins to be forgiven, and with a generall respect of temptations and afflictions that we desire to be delivered from, though for the instant we do not think vpon any of our particular sins temptations or afflictions; where are the proofes that condemne vs for so doing? 2. This is inconsequent: for suppose it were vnlawfull to vse this prayer vvithout some speciall relation or application there of to our particular occasions, yet what hinders but that in the vse of the very words of this prayer, we may also sometimes vpon occasion have relation to our particular sins and temptations, & to the particular meanes of glorifying God, though the words be generall which we vse.

Mat. 18. 10 Dan. 7. 10.

Thirdly, whereas you say: *Neither can any mans or Churches case*

case and vnderstanding reach vnto all things needful for all occasions, times and persons, as those heads do comprehend, this is also doubly inconsequent. 1, In respect of our estate and condition; for suppose no mans case reach vnto all things comprehended in this prayer: yet seing there is no word of this prayer but it doth evermore in a great measure and in the mayne alvvayes concerne every Christian mans estate, what forbids vs to vse the same as our prayer? 2. In respect of our vnderstanding; though no man can reach vnto all the things comprehended in this prayer, yet is it most senseless to argue from hence against the lavvfull vse of this prayer: for by this kinde of reasoning vve might reiect almost all prayers, all blessings and all salutations: for example, we are taught to pray thus in our salutations, *peace be vnto you: The Lord be with you: The Lord blesse thee:* And who can reach vnto the things that are comprehended in these short sentences vvhile he vseth the same? The whole summe of Gods covenant with the innumerable fruits and benefits thereof are certainely comprised herein.

Luk 10. 5. Ruth. 2. 4.

Apologie.

8. *Els why should not the ministers be as well bound at the end of their Sermons, and all Magistrates and people at their instructions & exhortations given vnto others, to say over the ten Commandements, because they do fully and shortly comprise all dueties.*

Answer.

First, our question is about the lawfulnes, not about the necessity of vsing this prayer: we do not say that ministers are bound to say over the Lords prayer at the end of every Sermō: much lesse do we say that all Magistrates and people are bound to vse it at the end of their instructions and exhortations: and thus this argument fayleth in the ground of that comparison from whence it is taken.

Secondly, what law of God forbiddeth ministers to repeat the 10. Commandements at the end of their Sermons? For the Ministers of these Reformed Churches, there are divers of them vvhich do ordinarily vpon the Lords day before their

exerciſe of Catechizing, repeate the 10. Commandements, & what is their ſin in this? If judges and Magiſtrates who are appoynted to be keepers of the Decalogue ſhould with the repetition hereof, either begin or conclude their publique and ſolemne charges and exhortations which at certaine times they give vnto people, vvho can condemne them for it? If Maiſters of families ſhould every day begin or conclude their family inſtructions with rehearſall of the 10. Commandements, ſhould not this be a teſtimony of their obedience to Gods
[a] Deut. 6. 7 8. 9. a law, rather then a tranſgreſsion thereof?

Thirdly, there is no equality nor juſt proportion in this compariſon: The vviſedome of God in his word teacheth vs ſhort formes of prayer for ſalutation in 2 or 3 words, becauſe vve have every day and hovver occaſion to vſe them: And ſeing in like maner there is dayly and hovverly occaſion of mutuall exhortation, though it were an abſurd and vnreaſonable thing contrary to the wiſedome of God, to conclude ech ſalutation & exhortation with the Lords prayer and 10. Commandements, more then an 100. times in a week, yet doth it not follow that it is vnlawfull or inconvenient once or twiſe in a week ſo to begin or conclude a ſolemne exerciſe in the Church of God.

Apology.

9. *Seing it is a moſt perfect forme of prayer, wherein is no want or ſuperfluity, if it were Chriſtes meaning to enjoyne the saying over of thoſe words for our prayer to God, then ought we to vſe theſe onely and no other. Becauſe it ſhould be but babling or preſumption to joyne or put other prayers in ſtead of that which is ſo abſolute and ſufficient. For the Lord will be worſhipped with the beſt we have, and he is accurſed that having a male for ſacrifice, doth offer a corrupt thing to the Lord.* Mal. 1. 14.

Anſwer.

Firſt, touching the type and ceremony wherein this argument is grounded: God doth not by *Malachie* denoūce the curſe againſt thoſe which refuſed to offer the beſt ſacrifice which they had, but againſt thoſe that offred corrupt contrary to the law

law which required a ſacrifice [b] without blemiſh: againſt thoſe eſpecially which were hypocrites and deceyvers, pretending love of God and yet brought corrupt things, [c] *torne, lame and ſick, &c.* A man that had a Kow and 2 Sheep was not bound to offer his Kow, but might lawfully reteyne the ſame and enjoy th: bleſsing [d] promiſed of God vnto his people. A poore man that hid 10. Sheep, and ſome of them thriſe ſo good as the reſt, was not bound to offer the beſt: the law onely required he ſhould offer that which was not corrupt. Yea in ſome kinde of ſervices, as in tithes, God would not have the beſt to be choſen out for him, but [e] would have that which paſſed vnder the rod, the 10th as it came by tale, and this without change, the better might not be given to God in ſtead of the worſe.

[b] Lev. 1. 3. 10. & 3. 1. & 4 3. 23.
[c] Mal. 1. 13 14.
[d] Eſa. 7. 21 22.
[e] Levit. 27. 32. 33.

Secondly, beſide your errour in the ſtory of this ceremony, conſider alſo how you erre in the application of this type vnto the queſtion in hand. If you will have it to ſerve your turne, you muſt prove that all prayers beſides the Lords prayer are corrupt things, like the lame and torne ſacrifices: for this place doth not prove that the excellency of one ſacrifice did exclude an other which hath not the ſame degree and meaſure of goodnes, but onely the corrupt and no other.

Thirdly, marke the contradiction of this argument with the 3d. 4th. & 7th. reaſons going before: here you wil have the Lords prayer being commanded to be *without ſuperfluity:* & all others joyned with it to be but babling: before you complayned and pleaded againſt the vſe of it, becauſe no mans or Churches caſe and vnderſtanding could reach vnto ſo many things as were compriſed in it: And is not this to condemne it of ſuperfluity? Here you argue that no other but it alone muſt be vſed, becauſe it is ſo abſolute and ſufficient, having *no want* in it: before you pleaded againſt the vſe of it becauſe it did not ſerve to expreſſe our particular wants and neceſsities: And is not this to condemne it for the defects thereof? Thus is it apparant, that theſe your reaſons do neither agree with the truth, nor with themſelves.

Tou-

TOuching Mr. Hu. his doctrine among vs about the condemning of read prayer, having ſhewed you the errour of that report which you obiected vnto me, both for the time thereof, and the matter thereof: as alſo for the erroneous vſe you collected thence: you omit to ſpeak of the firſt and laſt of theſe poynts: and touching the matter thereof you reply divers things: 1, that *you can go no further then report, &c.* but you had done well not to have gone ſo far, as it ſeemes the falſe report hath done: That which I have written vnto you is vpon my owne knowledge that heard him: and likevviſe vpon his owne explanation of himſelf vnro me before witneſſes, as I ſhevved you before. 2. You now tell me of an other report, *you heare alſo that he continueth like doctrine ſtill where he teacheth, &c.* But where doth he teach? is it not in the Church of England? you do wiſely not to name the place; the very naming thereof might well have holpen to bring this report into ſuſpicion of falſhood. Behold your partiality herein alſo: In this very page, where you write this of Mr. H. you would collect againſt me that becauſe *I was a publique miniſter in one of their Pariſhes in England I did by their ordinary calling there adminiſter by an other leitourgie then Chriſts Teſtament, even by their book of common prayer, impoſed vpon all the Pariſhes.* The errour of this collection I am to ſhew you, when I come vnto it. But in the meane time, I pray you tell me *Mr. Ainſworth:* Is not Mr. H. as publique a miniſter in one of the Pariſhes of England, as ever I was? was my publique miniſtery there a ſufficient proofe that I vſed the book of common prayer, and is not his publique miniſtery there as ſufficient a proofe that he allowes praying on bookes, even the book of common prayer? vvho ſees not your corrupt and partiall reaſoning againſt me? 3. You tell me further of his ſpeech with your ſelf before two that came with him, how *he ſignifyed his diſlike of reading prayers without any ſuch limitation*, &c. But I anſwer, limitations are not alwayes expreſſed, but oftentimes to be vnderſtood never the leſſe. And if he had ſpoken any thing vnto you contrary to that which he did

did to me, you might then lay ſome blame vpon him, but not on me that have ſufficient witneſſes to confirme that I ſay. 4. Suppoſe Mr. H. had openly and abſolutely condemned all read prayer as ſin, yet what would this avayle you? you tell me in your former writing that becauſe I receyved not the truth from him but oppoſed it, f *this is the chcefeſt thing that you miſlike in me about prayer*: May we not herein mark your diſpoſition? howſoever you blame others for alledging the names of men and of Churches againſt you, yet when there is but a ſhadow or half a teſtimony of one man that ſeemes to make for your cauſe, how greedily do you ſnatch at it, to make vſe of it for your advantage and our reproofe, even to make it *the cbeefeſt thing that you miſlike in me* that I receive not ſuch a teſtimony? How much more juſtly might I bring againſt you a cloud of witneſſes and this vpon certaine knowledge and not vncertaine reports, & of true miniſters in the Reformed churches, whereas Mr. H. in your accoũt is a falſe miniſter, a hireling a deceyver, & make it a *chcef matter of diſlike* in you that you deſpiſe the teſtimony of them all? Here alſo we have juſt cauſe to complaine for want of ſincere and vpright dealing in you allowing that vnto your ſelf which moſt partially you condemne in others. f Fol. 4. B.

CHAP. IIII.

Of communion vvith ſuch a miniſter as hath not renounced his miniſtery in he Church of England.

TOuching the ſecõd matter of your miniſterie: as I have not cõdemned that which is lawful: ſo neyther is it folly or ſyn, to inquire further of particulars, in things known to be vnlawful. I condemne the Romiſh miniſterie, & I hope you do ſo to: yet of ſome things about their calling and orders, I ſuppoſe we may without folly inquire. Morcover I think you are not ignorant, that queſtions may be aſked, not onely to informe our ſelves, but to convince others by their own anſwers: which alſo was my purpoſe in my foreſayd inquirie. For could the man have anſwered on your behalf, he had then heard

further: and in that he could not, he ſhewed his own folly and ſyn, in leaving the trueth, and going to joyn himſelf he knew not to what.

Whereas you profeſſe that you have not renounced the calling which you had in England, you therein bewray the vnlawfulnes of your preſent eſtate: for having been a publick miniſter there in one of their pariſhes, you did by the ordinarie calling there, adminiſter by an other leitourgie then Chriſts Teſtament, even by their book of common prayer impoſed on all the pariſhes. Which being forbidden by the 2. Commandement, and largely diſproved in ſome of the reaſons wherto I referred you in my former argument, which you have let paſſe: you ought to repent of that, as of other ſynns wherin there you walked. God alloweth not ſuch to declare his ſtatutes, as continew in their idolatrie: no man can ſerve two maiſters: the Temple of God, hath no agrement with idols: nor Gods true ſpiritual worſhip, with humane idolatrous leitourgies.

2 Cor. 6. 16.

That you had no calling to the work of your miniſterie by the Biſſhops in England is not eaſy for me to beleeve. It is knowen, that the publick miniſters of the Word and Sacraments there, are not admitted to their places, vnleſſe they have the Biſſhops licenſe vpon his ordination If you had it not, I ſuppoſe the Church of England, which you account to be Chriſts, will eſteem of you as a creeper into the office you executed: whereof you would entwite me.

Anſwer.

WHereas I had ſhewed your folly and ſin in raſh condemning of that thing, which afterwards you begin at laſt to enquire of; for this you bring an excuſe or two in vaine: Firſt, you ſay, we *condemne the Romiſh miniſtery, and yet of ſome things about their calling and orders, you ſuppoſe we may lawfully enquire*. But I anſwer if we raſhly condemne the Romiſh Miniſtery, in ſuch particular poynts as are partly vntrue and partly lawfull: we do both ſin againſt them, and cauſe the truth to be evill ſpoken of: and that ſo you have dealt with me, I hope the ſequel will manifeſt. Againe, you

you ſay, that *queſtiõs may be aſked not onely to informe our ſelves, but to convince others by their owne anſwers, which alſo was your purpoſe, &c.* But I anſwer, there is a further matter to be obſerved in your dealing, who make inquiry about ſuch things as you are ignorant of both for matter of right and of the fact it ſelf, and yet affirme ſo much concerning the ſame, as that you make your ſelf guilty of great errour and ſlander, as appeares in the next Chapter where you plead againſt the maner of my ordination and do moſt faſly alledge the acts of Synods touching the ſame matter.

The maine reaſon you bring to prove the vnlawfulnes of my preſent eſtate and of my miniſtery, is this, that *having bene a publique miniſter in one of their Pariſhes in England, I did by the ordinary calling there, adminiſter by an other leitourgie then Chriſts Teſtament, even by their book of common prayer, impoſed on all the Pariſhes*, &c. that *I ought to repent of that, as of other ſins wherein there I walked. God alloweth not ſuch to declare his ſtatutes, &c.*

I anſwer.

Firſt, your reaſon from my being a publique miniſter there, to ſhew my adminiſtration by the book of common prayer is inſufficient: for there have bene many publique miniſters in the Church of England that have not bene vrged to read the book of common prayer: though it be impoſed on all the Pariſhes, yet hath it not heretofore bene impoſed on all the Miniſters in every pariſh. There be in many Pariſhes two Miniſters, and formerly it hath bene required no further, then that one of them ſhould vſe the ſame: And ſo was it in the pariſh from whence I came into theſe countries, where an other miniſter did ordinarily vſe the ſame, ſo that it was not impoſed on me. Though you may except that I was partaker of that worſhip, or did vpon occaſion vſe that booke, yet alwayes this ſhewes the vnſoundnes and vntruth of your collection touching my particular adminiſtration by the ſame.

Secondly, whereas you write here how I have *let paſſe the reaſons wherevnto you referred me in your former argument, diſproo-*

ving

ving the administration by that leitourgie, &c. It is enough that I shew the falshood of your argument in that you separate from our congregation, and therfore not from sin onely as you pretend in your argument: This I shew by manifesting the weaknes of your reasons touching those pretended corruptions and want of repentance which you impute vnto vs for a ground of your separation from vs. And therfore though you tell me ten times oftner of letting passe those reasons which you referd me vnto as a devise to draw me from the present question layd downe betwixt vs, yet shall you be dissappoynted of your purpose herein.

Thirdly, suppose I had sinned either in the vse of the book of common prayer in my owne administration or by allowing it in others, yet so long as this sin is onely of ignorance, and I know it not to be sin: the want of particular repentance in this case doth not make my present ministery vnlawfull. By this reason of yours there should be no lawfull ministery vpon earth, seing there is no minister whosoever but he hath some sins which are vnknowne vnto him, even as a David, [b] Ieremy, c Paul, with other Prophets and Apostles: If they knew them not, then could they not have particular repentance for them they could not bring a particular sacrifice for their particular trespasses till they were [d] knowne vnto them: Now by your reasoning they were all of them in an vnlawfull estate, and were not allowed of God to declare his statutes. If you tell me that my sin of vnlawfull ministerie in the Church of England is made knowne vnto me by your writings, that I deny: I may as well and better tell you of your sinfull schisme and slander of that Church made knowne vnto you by divers treatises which I named before vnto you.

a Ps. [illegible] 12 & 40. [illegible] & 139. 4.
b Ier. 17. 9.
c 1 Cor. 4 4
d Lev. 4. 14 23. 28.

Fourthly, suppose I had bene convicted of an vnlawfull administration in England, and would not repent of the sin proved vnto me, though this would provoke the Lord against me, yet could not this be a sufficient warrant for you to disclaime our communion as vnlawfull and polluted. The holy scriptures

tures teach vs otherwise: though the Sonnes of Eli were wicked and [e] vnrepentant Ministers of the tabernackle in Shiloh, yet were not the godly taught to refuse communion with them, but still [f] frequented the place of publique worship where they administred. The Ministers of the temple in Christes time were [g] wicked persons refusing to repent of those sins whereof they were convinced by Christe, and yet he taught not his Servants to forsake or disclayme their communion but both [h] sent others and [i] went himself to joyne in the publique worship of God with them.

e 1 Sam. 3. .12--25.
f Ibid. Chap. 1. 3. & 3. 1.
g Luk 7. 30 Ioh 7 32.
h Luk 7. 14. Mat. 8 4.
i Luk 2 2 8 joh. 18. 20

Fiftly, if the not renouncing of my former calling in England do make me a false and vnlawfull Minister here, then are the ministers of these Reformed Churches vnlawful Ministers also being accessary and partakers with me of that pretended sin which you impute vnto me, because themselves occasionally do communicate with the ministery of England when they travel thither, and allow of my present estate without any renunciation thereof, giving me the right hand of fellowship herein. Now then seing those that [k] consent vnto other mens sins, that [l] rejoyce with them, that [m] see a theef and run with him, that [n] see adulterers and maintaine them, that [o] see Idolatours and favour them, do hereby enwrap themselves in the same condemnation: how comes it that you do not vpon this ground also renounce and disclaime the communion of these vnrepentant Ministers of the Reformed Churches? If this ground of renunciation be good why do you not also vse it as a motive to stay such of your people as do from time to time leave you & come vnto them & vs? How can you approve them for true Ministers more then me, if thus they partake with me? I write not these things to justify my estate by theirs as you vse to deprave me, but to reprove & convince your partiall judgement.

k Act. 22. 20.
l Esa. 5. 14.
m pf. 50. 18.
n judg. 20. 12. 13. 14, &c.
o josh. 22. 16. 17. 18.

Sixthly, by this reasoning you do yet further shew your nakednes vnto vs. If communion with vnrepentant Ministers is to be forsaken: then these Ministers of the Reformed Chur-

ches being by yóu admoniſhed of P eleven ſeverall tranſgreſ-
ſions wherein they continue without repentance, and in ſpe-
ciall in the vſe of ſuch read prayers as are in your account a hu-
mane Idolatrous leitourgie, ought by their people to be avoy-
ded for feare of polluting their ſoules with ſin. If this be ſo,
then you holding theſe people yet for your brethren, are
bound by the law of God to warne them of this their vncleane
communion. According to your owne doctrine you muſt be
the onely pure and vnpolluted Angell in all the Churches of
Chriſt, and of all the Angels of the Churches beſides, not one
that may be lawfully communicated withall: name, if you can,
any one miniſter either paſtour or teacher in the whole world
with whom you dare communicate in the Lords ſupper, or
heare a Sermon from them, and alſo can do it without tranſ-
greſſion of your owne doctrine. You being then ſuch a rare and
extraordinary Angel, doth it not become you, to q *fly in the*
miade of Heaven, or to r *ſtand in the Sun*, and openly with a loud
voice to cry vnto the Chriſtians in every nation, and kinred,
and tongue and people that they beware and take heed of their
polluted and vnlawfull miniſters leaſt they be defiled by them?
There was a promiſe or a ſhew made ſome ſ yeares ſince, that
your book of the *Communion of ſainctes* ſhould have come forth
in Latine at Franckfurdt Mart: but it was a falſe ſhew and a
mockery of the world: it is not yet come forth: But had it then
bene printed, your doctrine is couched therein ſo cloſely & ob-
ſcurely, that none who knew you not before, could have found
out your meaning thereby. If you will keep a good conſcience
in the profeſsion of that truth which you think is revealed
vnto you, you are then t plainely to admoniſh your brethren:
to u take a great rolle and write in it with a mans pen, *make ſpeed*
to ſeparate, *make haſt to renounce all your miniſters*: you are to
x write the viſiō of your ſeparation, and to make it plaine vpon
tables, that he may run, that readeth it. At leaſt wiſe, you ought
to admoniſh theſe many members of the Dutch and French
Churches herein the ſame city with you and to prove vnto
them

enquir. of Th white p. 78.79.

q Rev. 14.

r Rev. 19. 17.

ſ Catal. Francof. Año. 1608. Tractatus de communione. Amſtelodami apud Cornelium Nicolai in 8.

t Levit. 19. 17.

u Eſa. 8. 1.

x Hab. 2. 2.

them plainely and clearely this maine poynt that they ought
to refuſe communion with their vnrepentant Miniſters. VVe
accuſe the pope of great cruelty in that he profeſſeth he hath
power to deliver al the Soules out of Purgatory, if he would:
and yet will not do it: And we accuſe you likewiſe of great
cruelty, as wanting bowelles of compaſſion and brotherly love
in that you profeſs to ſee a holy & vndefiled path of Chriſtian
communion: and yet ſeeing ſo many thouſands of your bre-
thren dayly before your eyes to walk in an vncleane path that
pollutes their Soules, will not for all this ſhew them the good
way and ſet vp markes vnto them that they may walk in it. As
you found meanes to publiſh your confeſſion both in Latine
and Dutch, ſo if you had zeale and conſcience of this doctrine
that you profeſſe, you could ſoone finde meanes to publiſh a
few argumēts in Dutch & Latine alſo to call away the faithfull
people in this city where you live from their vnlawfull Mini-
ſters. Iudgement, mercy and fidelity are the y cheef matters of
Gods law, which ought cheefly to be done: but either you
want aſſurance of the truth in that you profeſſe, or els you want
Chriſtian love and compaſsion, which will not ſhew the way
of truth & peace vnto thoſe that go aſtray: eſpecially whē there
is none to do it but your ſelf: conſidering alſo that you can
finde time to publiſh ſundry other things, which in all reaſon
ſhould not ſo much touch your conſcience. Think on theſe
things in the feare of God.

y Mat. 23. 23.

Seventhly, this your doctrine of ſchiſme leads vs to ſee more
of your partiality: for if communion with vnrepentant mini-
ſters is to be refuſed: then how could you hitherto allow your
people to hold communion with *Mr. Robinſon* who repents not
of that ſin which you impute vnto him. In your judgement
he is a teacher of falſe doctrine, and a practiſer of the ſame, hol-
ding private communion with Antichriſtian Idolatours, and
members of a falſe Church as you eſteeme them: he openly
perſiſteth herein and draweth many with him to this practiſe; &
this alſo when as he had once condemned this courſe he takes

and written against the same, so that he is also an Apostate and a decliner from the truth formerly professed as you take it: and yet you have not renounced his communion. Behold then the balances of deceit and partiality in your hand: even the
y Prov. 11. 1, & 20, 10 false balances that are an y abhomination to the Lord: as a deceitfull merchant you vse one weight and measure in dealing with him, an other when you have to do with vs even about the same matter; he though an vnrepentant minister is not disclaymed and reiected by you, as others are. Is this to walk with a right foote vnto the truth of the Gospell, or rather to halt downe right in the pathes of hypocrisie and dissimulation? Your separation is a sin great enough of it self, though it were maintayned of mere ignorance, but when such partialitie is added vnto it, your sin becomes more sinfull, & the burden of it more greevous.

Eightly, as in the former answers, your sins of false doctrine cruelty and partiality vvere manifested, so in this place you are for them to heare the sentence of condemnation belonging vnto your self with as much reason as you have pronounced it against others: It appeares by your dealing above noted, that
z Ioh. 1. 47. you are not as Nathaneel an z Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile: you are not a sincere and vpright professour even of your owne separation; but an open perverter of righteousnes; what then is the sentence? your ministery is vnlawfull and to be reiected vntill you repent: As you thought to do vnto others, so may you expect that others should do vnto you. This is the fruit of your owne arguing, God allowes not such to declare his statutes as continue in sin, & therfore your communion is to be refused: Thus doth your foote slide into the pit that you digd for others.

Ninthly, according to this your reasoning is the ministery of *Iohn Declose* your elder to be avoyded also. His iniurious & false dealing in the a printing of Mr. Brightmans booke is a publique
a Shield of defence, p. 6. and 7. scandall: so are his manifold erroneous collections which he printed in his owne book against Mr. Brightman whereof he

he is also convinced in that book which was shortly after written for the refutation and reproof of him: likewise his false boasting not onely vnto the Eldership of the French Church, but also vnto the Magistrates of this city touching a publique testification to be made by him in the body of the French congregation, where at last his heart fayled him contrary to his word: Seing he hath not testifyed any due repentance for any of these open sins, therfore by your rule is his ministery vnlawfull not onely vnto himself, but vnto you and all that do communicate with him.

And note here *Mr. Ainsworth*, that you cannot help your self in this straite by any distinction of sins that you can make. For when as b before to prove the first proposition of your b Pag. 44. & Fol. 3, 15. maine argument, namely that *the separation which is onely from sin and communion therewith is of God and all good mens duety*: you there alledge all the the ten Commandements at once *Exo. 20. Eph. 5. 11. 2 Cor. 6. 14. 15. 16.* You do hereby cut of your self from any refuge or evasion by putting difference betwixt sin. For whether they be sins of constitution, or sins of publique worship, or administration, or whether they be other personall particular sins whatsoever, yet are they all forbidden in the 10. Commandements: they are all vnproffitable workes of darknes: they are all an vncleane thing not to be touched: and therfore making those places the ground of your separation from a Church or from the ministers thereof: you do alike without exception make any sin of what kinde soever, litle or great to be a warrant for separation when as it is openly knowne and tolerated without redresse. Consider what a large separation you do make hereby: even such a one as will lead you to separate from all Churches: such an one as you are never like to keep a good conscience in the profession thereof: such an one as leads all your people to separate both from you and your elder *Declose* both in respect of the former sins here noted, and in respect of many more publique offences which I could manifest in you both.

Tenthly, you may hereby discerne what just cause there is to publish the personall sinnes of such as maintaine your doctrines of schisme, seing one knowne sin of one particular person among them not repented of is sufficient to overthrow their ministery and Church it self, and so enough to stay any person from joyning vnto such a separation. *H. Barow* writeth, that c *the knowne and suffered sin of any one member is contagious vnto all such as communicate with him in that estate & maketh them all which communicate in prayers and Sacraments with such an obstinate offendour, as guilty in Gods sight, as he himself is.* And againe the contrary doctrines of *Mr. Calvine* and others, that the open sinnes of vnrepentant offendours do hurt neither the Sacramēts nor the godly receyvers, &c. he calleth *the* d *smoaky errours of Mr. Calvine and his disciples*, he calleth them *blasphemous hellish doctrine, which take away at once the whole Testament of Christe and word of God, or tolerate the open breach of them: which take away all Christian liberty, duty and communion.* If these things be so as he writes and as you plead against me, to shew the vnlawfullnes of my ministery for want of repentance touching my calling in England, then is it a just thing to take this compendious course for the manifesting of your vnlawfull estate, Church, Ministery and communion, as being contrary to the whole Testament of Christ and word of God, as being a blasphemous hellish profession, if any can declare and shew *the knowne and suffred sin of any one member* among you. If these things be so, then have you no cause to complaine and condemne the writings which beare witnesse of such sins among you, to be *libelles*, but rather to yeeld that they are wholesome and necessary warnings to keep every Christian man from such a contagious and polluted communion.

c H. Barow discov. pag. 34.

d ibid. p. 35. 36.

In the xi. place, it is not vnmeet to observe and remember here, that you who are so hard and vnrighteous a judge and censurer of all true Churches and ministers, are yet further guilty of such sinnes as though they were repented of, yet do they according to your owne profession leave so deep a blott & staine vpon

vpon you as that they make you vncapable of the ministery, & vnlawfull to be chosen by any people vnto so holy a work. For if the Church of England be such a false church, such a Babylon and Egipt as you vvould make it: if their worship be such grosse and abhominable Idolarry, as e you yourself do describe the same, then are you for your divers *Apostasies* and declininges vnto the same to be excluded and kept out of the ministery. They that f beare the vessels of the Lord ought to be cleane & holy in speciall maner: It is required that his ministers should be g vnreproveable as the stewards of God; that so they might the better speak, exhort and convince with all authoritie, and see that no man despise them. But as those that have bene blotted with the shame of murder, adulteries, or Theftes after they have professed the Gospell, are vnmeet to be chosen ministers for the rebuking of lesser sins, when themselves are so scandalously guilty of greater; so those *Apostates* & backsliders which after they have receyved the knowledge of the truth, and forsaken the false Church do againe fall back vnto Idolatrie and this divers times, do in like maner deprive themselves of the honour of being called vnto the publique ministery of the Gospel. Now you being such an Apostata as according to your present profession have sundry times turned back vnto the Idolatrous false Church, as hath bene by divers persons witnessed, neither could *Mr. Johnson* deny the same, when he h was most desirous to excuse you therein: though it was obiected that you had turned your coate as oft if not ofner then D. Perne: the vnlawfulnes of your calling and ministery doth then appeare hereby. Let it be well observed that you are thus noted to have turned your coate & changed your religion *five* severall times, namely, *first* being of our religion and a member of the church of England you forsook that Church and separated: *Secondly*, that being separated, you did againe in *London* being in the bāds of authoritie yeeld to joyne with the worship and ministery of the Church of England: *Thirdly*, that after this you did againe slide back vnto the separation and renounce the Church of

e Counterpoy. from pag. 127. to 152.

f Esa. 52. 11

g 1 Tim. 3. 2. Tit. 1. 5. 7. and 2. 15. 1 Tim. 4. 12.

h Inquir. of Th. wh. p. 41. 42.

En-

England: *Fourthly*, that after this when you were in *Ireland* and in ſome danger of puniſhment for your ſcandal, you did againe returne vnto the communion renounced by you, whether fainedly or vnfainedly, I leave vnto your ſelf to conſider: *Fiftly*, after this you change your profeſſion againe and fall back vnto ſeparation, and ſtick now preſently in this Schiſme: and thus whiles by this often revolting you diſhonour and diſable your ſelf and your miniſtery, you will yet exalt your ſelf above all the Miniſters of Chriſt in the world, and by your profeſsion maintaine that your ſelf onely may be joyned vnto, and that no other Miniſter may lawfully be heard: & if this be not ſo, I pray you name who and how many there be that you durſt allow your people to communicate with all. Is it not a rare and an extraordinary thing that ſuch a ſcandalous and vnſtable apoſtata ſhould yet notwithſtanding maintaine ſuch a ſeparation from all the faithfull Miniſters of the Lord, and therein boaſt of your owne onely lawfull eſtate? Think not that I write theſe things in any hatred of your perſon which I love: but for your good, for your humbling and the warning of others: I think verily that it ſhould be my ſin if vpon ſo juſt occaſion I ſhould conceale this work of God vpon you in judging and puniſhing your ſchiſme by giving you vp vnto theſe offenſive and ſtrange revolts, when as himſelf would have ſuch c *wandring ſtarres* to be noted, obſerved and taken heed of.

c Iude. 13.

XII, not to inſiſt vpon many other things that might aggravate this your ſcandall, when as you were thus ſtayned with apoſtaſy: when as at this ſame time it was the profeſſion of your Church not to admit ſuch apoſtates into office among you: when as others among you had for the like apoſtaſy bene debarred from the inferiour offices of Elder and Deacon among you, and many reaſons had bene written by Mr. Iohnſon and others among you for the defence of this courſe, as I could ſhew at large by the copy of thoſe reaſons which I have by me: yet notwithſtanding even then contrary to the profeſsion of your Church, you creep in deceitfully into the office of your teacher, your apoſtaſy being hidden for the preſent from the eyes of your people that called you. As the deceitfull woman that hath playd the harlot before mariage and joyneth her ſelf vnto a man that ſuppoſeth her to be a virgin, doth herein greevouſly d offend by taking vpon her vnlawfully the eſtate of mariage whereof ſhe was vncapable while her ſin was kept cloſe: even ſo you being polluted with ſpirituall whordome & fornication, with groſſe Idolatry and apoſtaſy as your Church eſteemeth it, do yet take vpon you deceitfully ſuch an eſtate, & ſuch an office as by the preſent & publique profeſſion of your Church you were not capable of, and ſhewed your ſelf to be far from plaine and ſimple dealing. But further if that deceitfull and diſhoneſt harlot being by her huſband pardoned and her deſerved puniſhment by the judges remitted: If after all this I ſay, this ſcandalous woman ſhould boaſt her ſelf againſt all other honeſt women, as if ſhe alone were the onely lawfull wife with whom a godly huſbād might ſafely live in coniugall ſociety: might not this well be accounted a wonderfull and ſtrange inſolencie; and might we not juſtly ſay with the Prophet concerning ſuch an impudent perſon, that ſhe had a e *whores forehead*, & that *would not be aſhamed?* And yet this is your very caſe and want of humility who after ſuch ſcandall & vnlawfull creeping into office, after that the ſignes and tokens of your virginitie were loſt, do yet in like maner boaſt your ſelf and profeſſe ſuch a ſeparation, that according to it no miniſter in the world but your ſelf alone may lawfully be heard & joyned vnto.

d Deut. 22. 20. 21.

e Ier. 3. 3.

Touching my calling in the Church of England notwithſtanding the licenſe and allowance which I had from the Biſhop, yet did the ſubſtance of my callling conſiſt in the free & generall conſent of the people who being publiquely aſſembled togather, did then chooſe me to be a teacher vnto them: If ſome in the Church of England do judge otherwiſe concerning the calling of Miniſters, there are others againe even in the ſame Church that are of the ſame judgement vvith me and

with the Reformed Churches: But let the reader here obserue that you who do so often vse to blame others for alledging the judgements of other Churches and persons euen then when they do it not, are yet ready vpon the least occasion to do the same thing that you condemne, if with any colour you can.

XIII. Besides this, you being deposed from the office of a teacher by *Mr. Iohnson* and his company for your schisme & rending from them, as they testify, having f *a sinfull vsurpation of all the holy things of God vsed among you*: and standing in this *heavy estate*, as he calleth it; it were now more meet you should look vnto your owne vsurped office, then to seek to seduce the people of God from their lawfull ministers whersoever they are: For if *Mr. Iohnson* and his people were a true Church and their communion lawfull, during the time of your continuance among them: then were they so likewise at your departure from them. And suppose they erred in the change of their gouernement, and in some other matters which you impute vnto them, yet was that no sufficient warrant for you to separate from a true Church. Godly men may keep their garments and g *walk in white*, euen there where others continue in open sin. And therfore your separatiō from them being vnjust, your deposition by them is just vpon you, and your presen estate & ministery vnlawfull.

f Advert. of R. Clift. pag. 58.

g Rev. 3. 4.

Lastly, as for the scriptures which you alledge to shew the vnlawfull estate of vnrepentāt ministers; viz, that *God alloweth not such to declare his statutes, &c.* that *no man can serve two Maisters: that the temple of God hath no agreement with Idolls, &c.* I answer, that although these scriptures serve to condemne vnrepentāt Ministers, yet do they not serve to condemne all such as communicate with them, which is the poynt in hand: our question being about separation, and the lawfulnes of communion with vnrepentant persons. The Iewish ministers were such as hated h to be reformed, & in that respect had no right to declare the statutes of the Lord: yet had others i right to heare them. Against them did our Saviour apply that saying:

2 Cor. 6. 16.

h Mat. 21. 45. 46.

i Mat. 23. 1. 2. 3.

No

No man can serve two Maisters: and they skoffed at him. And yet in the next Chapter he l sends men to communicate with them. Of such as they were, the Prophet speakes when he denounceth wo vnto the m *Idol-shepheards*: Though for their wickednes they had no right vnto the temple of God, yet did not our Saviour separate from that temple wherein these Idols ministred and remayned: others lost not their right vnto the temple of God, because of their vnrighteousnes in the same.

k Luk. 16. 13. 14.

l Luk. 17. 14.

m Zach. 11 15. 16. 17 with Luk. 11. 52.

CHAP. V.

Touching ordination of Ministers.

For your calling here, if there were that errour onely in your ordination which I intend, and no other fault to be found with you, in respect of your former estate in England before mentioned, or otherwise: I grant that therfore it is not vnlawfull for any to hear you, yet ought this errour, as all other to be acknowledged & forsaken: and they are to be blamed, which leave the church and ministery erected according to God, to goe vnto corruptions. Hen. Ainsw.

Wheras to help mine ignorance, you propound reasons from the book of God: had they been to the point in controversie, I would have thanked you for so doing: and the rather because in the former things, you pressed me with the names of churches. But your reasons doe not satisfie the question, which was about Authoritie *of the Eldership of one Church, to make or ordeine ministers in an other. As for mutuall advise, counsell, help and the like: I account them good and lawfull.*

To your 1. reason therfore I answer, the help of other churches may be sought for and vsed, if there be need, for counsel, instruction, exhortation, in all holy ducties. But not to doe those actions which are peculiar for every Church to doe in it self: neither doe any of the scriptures which you cite prove otherweise. Moses and the Apostles had extraordinarie callings of God, to doe things which ordinarie Ministers may not doe. If Churches at their first gathering, want knowledge to do their dutie: let neighbour Churches direct them by the law of God, how to doe it: but not vsurp their power. Elders were to be ordeyned

deyned in every Citie, if any were found fit for the charge, Tit. 1. 5. 6. otherwise it were better to stay the work, (as the Apostle stayed and did it not himself,) then to have it doen amysse. So if the Church be vnfit to doe the works therof, they should stay til they be better informed: and not put it over to others, whom God hath not appointed therto. The Churches in the villages of Netherland, may not be vrged for our patterne, vnlesse they cannot erre in their practise: but the Churches in Gods book, obeying him, are to a be our example.

a 1 Thes. 1. 6. 7.

The same things I answer to your second reason.

To your third: It appeareth not by Rom. 16. 1. that Phœbe the Diaconesse of the Church at Cenchrea, should execute her office in the Church at Rome: it followeth not because she had busines there, and needed their assistance, that therfore she went to doe the work of her ministerie there. Neyther because the Church at Corinth sent messengers to cary their liberalitie to Ierusalem. 1 Cor 16. 3. doth it follow that their ordinary Deacons were their messengers: much lesse what they should doe their Deacons office in Ierusalem, to gather and distribute the benevolence. Who would not rather think that they delivered their gift to the Church or Officers, and left them to dispose of it? And the same answer serveth vnto 2 Cor. 8. 19. 22. 24. which you alledge: it proveth not those messengers were Deacons of one Church, and did the Deacons office in an other.

To your 4. I grant that the Prophets of one Church, may propheſie in an other, Act. 13. 15. and may apply their doctrines, exhortations & prayers, to any actions of the Churches where they speak: but this onely by way of doctrine, &c. not to do the work which belongeth to the Church. It is holden by the Hebrewes, and I think rightly, that b any wise man might see the plague of leprosie, and advise the Preist to pronounce it vnclean or clean, or to shut vp: yet none but the Preist himself, might pronounce it vnclean or clean, Lev. 13. 3. 4. Deut. 24. 8.

b Thalmud in Negaghnim, c. 2

To your 5. I confesse, and it is our practise, that the members of one Church, may receive the Lords supper in an other, coming thither occasionally, yet will it not hereupon follow, that the ministers of one church should administer the Sacraments, or ordeine ministers by vertue

vertue of their office, in an other Church. My reasons are: The Ministers have a peculiar relation to their particular flocks onely, Act. 20. 28. Heb. 13. 17. 1 Pet. 5. 1. 2. Apostles, and all vniversall Ministers, are now ceassed. As an husband is no husband but to his own wife: a Father, to none but his own children, &c. so a sheepherd or minister, to none but his own flock. But for the seales of the covenant the case is otherwise. For a baptised person is baptised not to that particular Church onely, but to all churches: and in every particular Church where he cometh, he hath all the Privileges of a Baptised person, in respect of his Baptisme, and is so to be estemed of by them. Now all circumcised persons, had right therby c to eat the Passover in any so. cietie, in the place which God should choose to put his name there: so all baptised persons have right to the Lords supper, in every true church where God hath set his name. But the rulers of particular synagogues had not the same authoritie in all synagogues, nor pastors now in all flocks. So when a Christian cometh to a flock where their Pastor feedeth them, he joyneth himself to them for that time and action, & is fed with them as one of Christs sheep. Shew you the like warrant for Elderships to doe the works peculiar to their office, in other Elderships or Churches: shew that any eldership may ordeine ministers in their consistories, & send them as ministers to other churches: (though those churches, vpon trial of their gifts, be content to accept them for their ministers,) as I have heard the practise is of some consistories, vnto the Dorpes or Villages of Netherland, whose example you alleged.

c Exod. 12. 4. 48. Deut. 16. 1. 2.

To your 6 I answer, that the Ministers now, being over d particular churches onely, which in respect of their particular covenants are distinct bodies, as you acknowledge: herein lyeth the restreynt of their ministerie, by the speciall ordinance of God, Act. 20. 28. No man may take the honour of ministration of holy things, but he that is called e of God as Aaron: but God hath given them no office to administer in other churches. And if the Apostles, who had a large ministerie over all, yet would not boast of things without their f measure, in an other mans line: much lesse may the ministers of particular churches. Although in the general bōd of Christianitie, they may afford any help, not

d Rev. ch. 2. and 3.

e Heb. 5. 4.

f 2. Cor. 10. 13. 16.

passing the bounds of their calling, as before I granted. But the ordination or making of ministers, is a work of power or authoritie, Mat. 28.18.19. Heb 5.1.4. which power is not given to one Church or minister over an other: and therfore cannot, by vertue of the common faith, be by them performed. And whereas you intimate, as if your Church intreated the ministers of an other church, to performe it in their name, &c. I have cause to doubt that the thing was not so caried: both for that I have not heard that the ministers of the other church, (being also of an other language,) ever came into your publick congregation, (according to the lawes in your first reason alleged, Exod. 29. 4. Levit. 8.3.4.) to make publick prayers, and to give exhortations to your Officers and people touching their mutual duties, and so to ordeyn your ministers: as also because it is not their manner to ordeyn ministers publickly in their own churches, it being by their g canons, to be doen in the classical assemblies or consistories. I have heard it also testified by some that have been long members both of the Dutch and French: that they never did see the ordination of the ministers, though sundry were taken into office in their time. Finally, in this your plea, how doe you disible your own church, and the 3. other Elders that with you were authorized to feed your flock: as if there were not one amongst you, which could performe this work of ordination, or shew the minister and people their mutuall duties.

g Synod in Graven Haghe anno. 15 } 6 art. 4. & Synod in Midleburgh. anno. 1581 art. 4.

Answer.

Io. Pa. AS I observed in my former writing and in my first answer touching this poynt, so you do here yeeld and grant, that *it is not vnlawfull for any to heare me*, namely in respect of the supposed errour of my ordination if that were all: yet you adde with all, that *this errour as all other ought to be acknowledged and forsaken*, &c. Now in this your grant, you yeeld me the cause and overthrow your self in the maine question betwixt vs touching the lawfulnes of communion with our Church and ministery: for whereas before & after againe you do obiect our want of repentance as the maine ground of your sepa-

separation from vs, you do here notwithstanding confesse that this prætended errour of my ordination doth not destroy communion with vs, and yet you know we neither acknowledge it nor forsake it, nor repent for it any more then for the rest of the errours which you impute vnto vs. Thus you do plainely yeeld against your self, that there may be publique corruptions and sins vnrepented of, and yet a lawfull communion with such impenitent persons. You alledged for your separation from sin the 10. commandements, Exod. 20. If the errour of my ordination be a corruption to be acknowledged, & forsaken, thē must it needes be a transgressiō of some of the ten commandements: and how comes it then that this errour vnrepented of hath a priviledge not to be separated from, rather then other errours and corruptions? you alledged also *Eph.* 5. 11. *and* 2 *Cor.* 6.14.15.16. for a proof of your separation from sin and communion therewith: if the maner of my ordination be an errour to be repented of as you say, then must it needes be a worke of darknes: and tell me then I pray you how this work of darkenes vnrepented of gets a dispensation not to be separated from rather then other workes of darkenes. Surely your separation is not vnlike the Pope in his dispensative, exemptive and transcendēt power that can give at pleasure such speciall indulgence for speciall sinnes, errours and works of darkenes vnrepented of. You affirme hereafter that this work of ordination executed and done by the Elders of an other congregation is an *vsurpation* contrary to the scriptures *Act.* 20. 28. *Mat.* 28.18.19. Heb. 5.4. do you not herein then acknowledge that it is lawfull to hold communiō with such as do submit vnto vsurpers, and do administer the word and Sacraments by vertue of an ordination received and derived from an vsurped power? *Mr. Ainsworth*, I do earnestly desire and require both you and your people in the name of Christe that you wil consider of these things without preiudice and partialitie, and so doing I doubt not but vpon this your grant, you wilbe led forward to entertayne more Christian communion with vs:

and

& that other ſuppoſed errours among vs ſ hall not be a ſtumbling block vnto you any more then this is. The Lord give you eares to heare and a heart to vnderſtand.

Furthermore whereas I vrged you ſo earneſtly in my former writing to hold vnto the matters of ſeparation and you alſo profeſſed to do the ſame: how comes it that you inſiſt vpon this diſpute about my ordination, and yet acknowledge that for this errour *it is not vnlawfull for any to heare me?* Had you confeſſed ſo much, or had I knowne ſo much at the firſt. I would not have propounded any arguments concerning this poynt, but would have held onely to the pretended cauſes of your ſeparation from vs. VVhereas you complaine further that my reaſons are not to the poynt in controverſie, &c. I take it they touch the poynt ſufficiently when as they both ſerve to juſtify the maner of my ordination; and to refute your contrary opinion: when as I ſhew againſt you that the mutuall counſell & help of neighbour churches are not onely good and lawfull in generall, as you grant: but alſo in executing & performing this particular work of ordination one for another as need is, and as they are entreated therevnto.

MY firſt argument to warrant the help of neighbour miniſters for performing the work of ordination in other Churches, was taken from the neceſſity of many churches that often want fit perſons among themſelves for the performance thereof, &c. In your anſwer herevnto there are many faults:

1. You pervert my allegation of ſcriptures from Moſes and the Apoſtles, as if I had cited them to prove that ordinary miniſters might imitate them or do as much as they in their extraordinary power which I neither wrote nor thought: But as appeares by my former a writing together with the note of reference vnto the Margent, I alledged them onely to ſhew that *the work of ordination did conſiſt principally in ſuch publique prayers and exhortations as that many Churches did want fit and able perſons to performe the ſame.* And ſo much the b ſcriptures therevnto applyed do prove vnto vs, neither can you juſtly deny the ſame.

a Pag. 16.

b Exod. 29. 1--35. Lev. 8. 1. 2. &c. Numb. 27. 18. 19. 23. Deut. 31. 7. Act. 6. 6. & 13. 2. 3.

2. VVhere-

2. VVhereas you ſay, *that Elders were to be ordeyned in every citie, if any were found fit for the charge, Tit. 1. 5. 6. otherwiſe it were better to ſtay the work,* &c. And then further infer by way of ſimitude, that *So if the Church be vnfit to do the works thereof, they ſhould ſtay till they be better informed,* &c. I anſwer, that your compariſon herein is very vnequall: for of miniſters and Elders God hath expreſſely and preciſely required ſundry ſpeciall graces and endowments of his ſpirit, neceſſary for their publique adminiſtration, without which they may not be ordeyned or choſen: It is reaſon their election ſhould be ſtayd, vntill thoſe graces that God requireth be in ſome meaſure diſcerned in them: But as for the other members of the Church, God never exacts of them ſuch abilities of publique exhorting and praying in the congregation; It is ſufficient for them if they have true faith and repentance, though in weak meaſure; And therfore there is no reaſon that they ſhould be deprived of a miniſter ſo long, vntill themſelves be able to preach vnto their preacher at his ſolemne ordination.

3. VVhereas I alledged, *Heb. 3. 2. and Eſa. 5. 3. 4.* to ſhew that *the wiſedome and faithfulnes of Chriſt in his Fathers houſe would not ſtand with ſo ſtraite an order as you plead for.* To theſe ſcriptures you anſwer never a word, but ſmoothly paſſe by them, and ſo avoyd the force of my argument compriſed therein. According to your opinion it will follow that Iſrael of old were in better eſtate for obteyning of miniſters in temple and ſynagogue by the order that Moſes ſet downe, then we are in the new Teſtament by the order that Chriſt hath left vs; you will have that Chriſt cannot ſing of his vineyard now as he did of old *What could I have done more vnto my vineyard that I have not done vnto it?* Of old there was away vnder Moſes to call labourers into the vineyard, though the perſons in ſeverall ſynagogues, could not preach for their ordination: this way is now ſtopped vp by your doctrine.

4. Rather then all the churches be deprived of miniſters by ſtaying till ſome among themſelves were able to preach at

their ordination according to your counsell, I would think it meet that ministers being lawfully chosen should proceed vnto their administration without any solemne confirmation at all, according to the distinction which I propounded in the beginning of this first argument, viz, *Either ordination is not simply necessary: or els, &c.* For where is there any proof from the scriptures for such a necessity of ordination that the worke of ministery is to be stayed for want thereof?

5. As for the Churches in the villages of these Netherlands I did not alledge their example for a rule of right that we are bound to imitate, as you would make the reader beleeve: and therfore you have needlesly alledged 1 Thess. 6. 7. against me: but I onely alledged their necessitie and their want for an instance of that which I had sayd before to shew what evil would follow vpon your doctrine, to the desolation of many Churches by with-holding ministers from them, till they were able to performe the great and weighty dueties of that solemne ordination whereof I spoke

6. That which is here sayd concerning ordination may further appeare if we consider an other worke of *examination* which is as b requisite (if not more) in the calling of a minister, as is ordination: and doth also as much belong to the power of the Church, as ordination: yet experience shewes that many godly and simple Christians are not able to performe this worke considering the subtilty of many deceitfull and learned heretiques which creep into churches. And therfore help to do the same from the Ministers of other churches is oft most necessary, and not onely to informe the churches herein but to performe this action for them.

b 1 Tim. 3. 10. & 5. 22.

VNto my second reason which was taken from the like necessitie of help in discerning and convincing of errours & heresies, you say that you *answer the same things*, which you did vnto my former reason. Then will it follow herevpon

c Animad. vers. p. 133.

1. That vvhen your people sent vnto Mr. *Robinson* & c entreated him to come and *help the Lord against the mighty*, against Mr.

Mr. Iohnson: according to your former answer vnto me, he ought also to have answered your people, and sayd: I will give you the best help, counsell and advise that I can, I will direct & enforme you how to convince Mr. Iohnson, but to do it my self I may not least I should vsurp the power of the Church. For the conviction of errour is an Eccleiasticall action, & it is a work of power belonging to the church, and layd vpon the Church, as well as is the pronouncing of the censure and sentence against sin convicted. But because he did not vse this answer, but came to do the thing it self, it will follow by your answer that therfore he was an vsurper herein, and you also guilty of his vsurpation in seeking the same.

2. It will follow hence also, that either some learned and subtile heretiques shall be tolerated in the Church: or els that they must be reiected without sufficient conviction going before: for dayly experience shewes that some heretiques are so learned, and the godly members of some congregations are so weak that they are not able sufficiently to convince such great deceivers. Neither is it in this case sufficient for neighbour ministers to help them with counsell and to informe them vvith arguments vnless they come and do the deed themselves, vnless they performe the work of conviction for them: even as it is not sufficient to put a sword into a d Childes hand and to tell him how he shall vse it to overcome a strong and expert warriour. If *Vorstius* had bene minister in some of the weakest congregations in this countrey, which yet I think you acknowledge true churches, and should have seduced the wisest and greatest part of the Church to his manifold errours, what appearance is there that the rest could by their disputations have convinced him? If you would allow others in this case to come and vndertake the disputation for their help, then is the Ecclesiasticall action of convicting a sinner to be performed and done by the help of other Churches.

d Heb. 5. 11. 14. with judg. 8. 20.

MY third reason was taken from a like duety of *the Deacons and Widowes of one church which are to performe service vnto*

an other when need requires, &c. In your answer herevnto you pervert that I sayd, and touch not the poynt of my argument at all. As for *Phœbe*, I sayd not that *she went to do the work of her ministerie at Rome*, but the commendation that Paul gives of her *Rom.* 16, 1. compared with the verse following proves as much as I sayd, and that divers wayes. 1, vpon that commendation of Paul, if he had bene in need, the Deacons and vvidowes of the Church of Rome, were bound to minister vnto her though none of their Church. 2, if being at Rome she had desired help of that Church for the poore in Corinth; the Deacons of the Romane Church, vpon that commendation of Paul were bound to have contributed and so by her to have performed service vnto the Corinthian Church. 3, by the commendation that Paul gives her it appeares that she had *given hospitalitie vnto many*, and consequently, that the vvidowes of one Church were to performe service vnto an other in entertayning the strangers that came from them. Touching the messengers that were to cary the Corinthian almes vnto Ierusalem 1 *Cor.* 16, 3. I sayd not that they were *their ordinary Deacons* as your answer imports: but seing Paul promiseth to send whomsoever they should allow by their letters, this shewes that if they had entrusted their Deacons vvith this busines, he would also have sent them: and so this proveth that the Deacons might lawfully have bene sent and consequently this shewes as much as I sayd: For. 1. if the Deacons might have bene sent, then though they had neither made any gathering nor further distribution at Ierusalem, but onely delivered their present vnto the Officers there, as you say, yet this their labour in travelling so long & dangerous a journy even about a 1000. miles from Corinth to Ierusalem might be a sufficient testimonie, that the Deacons of one Church might performe service to an other, yea happily more service and labour of love, then they should have done at home in a whole twelve month togather if they had not gone. 2, for as much as in the primitive Church there were many e love Feasts and tables provi-

e Iude, 12. Act 6.2. & 2.46.

ded

ded, where the godly and the poore did eat their meat together with gladnes and singlenes of heart, admit now that the Deacons of the Corinthian Church having delivered some almes vnto the Officers of the Church at Ierusalem, should yet further in the name of those that sent them have made a love feast vnto some afflicted members of that Church and girding themselves should have come forth and ministred chearefully and lovingly vnto them; what fault would you finde in this service and ministration performed vnto an other Church? 3, the afflictions, bands and imprisonment of the ministers & people in those dayes being great, admit that the Deacons of the Church of Corinth, should also by the appointment of the church have taken paynes to seek them out in their prisons, & stayd some time both to distribute some particular gifts vnto some by name and further also to minister vnto them for their comfort, as f *Epaphroditus* g, *Onesiphorus* & h *Onesimus* did vnto Paul, what blame could you impute vnto these Deacons that thus should performe service vnto an other Church? And this same reply serves also to take away your answer made vnto *2. Cor.* 8 *19. 22. 24.* which I had alledged to the same purpose with the former place.

f Philip. 2. 25-30. g 2 Tim. 1. 16. 17. 18. h Philem. 11, 13.

IN answer to my 4th argument, you yeeld me the cause: for while you grant that the Prophets of one Church, may prophesie in an other and apply their doctrines, exhortations and prayers to any actions of the church where they speak; you do also grant that the act of ordination which consisteth in these things is then performed. VVhen you distinguish that he may thus pray and Prophesy, *by way of doctrine, &c.* but *not to do the work* which belongeth to the Church, you do herein contradict your self: for when doctrine, exhortations and prayers are solemnely applyed to the person elected and to the church electing touching their mutual duety, &c. then is the act of ordination performed and done. If you had thought otherwise, you ought to have named the other particulars which are of necessity further required: as for the ceremonie of imposition of

hands. 1, there is no commandement that bindes so strictly therevnto, that the act of ordination should be condemned for the want of it. 2, by your owne confession this hath bene heretofore the practise of your owne church, i *the outward signe being omitted* at the ordination of the minister among you, when you had no Elders; and still you shew your opinion in the case spoken of that for *the* k *outward signe onely you would not contend*. 3. If the Prophets of one congregation may approve the act of an other Church in their ordination, by word in doctrine and prayers, why may they not also by their hand declare the same approbation? we see that the l Prophets in the Church of Antioch, though they were no vniversall ministers, did yet lay hands on *Paul and Barnabas* for their confirmation in that work of ministerie which was to be exercised in other places.

i Animadverf. p.65.

k Ibid. p.66.

l Act.13. 2.3.

But for your help in this matter, you runne vnto the *Thalmud* and from thence you tell me, *It is holden by the Hebrewes and you think rightly, that any wise man might see the plagne of Leprosie & advise the Priest to pronounce it vnclean or clean, or to shut it vp*: Herevnto I answer.

First, you give too much honour vnto these authors alledged when you call them *Hebrewes*, whereas you should rather have called them Thalmudists, whose lāguage is n noted as a distincte speech from the Hebrew; their saying is, o *leschon mikra lechod, leschon Thalmud lechod*; their language through their dispersion being degenerate and changed, like vnto them p that spake half in the speach of Ashdod: A man that vnderstood the Hebrew perfectly might yet be ignorant of this Thalmudicall barbarous speech. And these Thalmudists (as you your self do q acknowledge concerning the Hellenists) could not say with the Apostle that they were r *Ebrewes*, or *Ebrewes of Ebrues*.

n Schind. pentaglot. tit.

o Aben Ezra in Eccle. cap. 5. i

p Nehem. 13.24.

q defenc. against. Mr. Sm. p.73. to 76

r 2 Cor. 11. 22. Phil. 3. 5.

Secondly, what have we to do with the opinions of these fabulous and blasphemous Thalmudists, whose dotages and blasphemies are innumerable? Cannot the controversie betwixt vs be decided by the word of God, and by the voyce of the holy scriptures, vnlesse the voyce of this vnholy *Thalmud* be also called for and admitted to speak betwixt vs?

Thirdly, for this allegation in particular, your forgerie or mistaking herein is very notable; for in the place of the Thalmud quoted by you, there is no such thing to be found as you mention. There is no such generall mention of *any wise* man as you speak: There is not a word mentioned for *the advising of the Priest to provounce cleane or vncleane or to shut vp any*. Equitie requires, that we corrupt not nor falsify the sayings of the worst men. He that depends vpon the Thalmud for his direction shalbe fed with the winde and follow after the east winde as s Ephraim did: But he that gives credit vnto your allegations of the Thalmud, being like vnto this, shalbe doubly deceyved.

s Hos. 12.1

Fourthly, when as I searched for your allegation in the Thalmud, in stead of that which you say, I finde in the same place such idle and vaine traditions of the Rabbines as might justly serve to discredit the testimonies of such witnesses: as namely, their appoynting of certaine Canonicall houres whē the plague of leprosy is to be seene: t not in the morning, nor in the evening, nor yet at noone tide, &c. also their traditionall rule for the position both of the man and womans body when their lepry is to be seene, viz. u that the man must be seene as a man that holdes the plow or shakes the olives, meaning with the hands and feet spread forth, &c. that the woman must be seene as one that dresseth or giveth such to her childe, as one that weaves, &c.

t Thalmud in Negagh. c.2. sec. 2.

u Ibid. sec.4.

Fiftly, beside these and other vaine traditions, there be also such contradictions among them even in the same place, as may yet further shew what litle credit is to be given vnto the allegations brought from such disagreeing witnesses: as first vpon a Thalmudicall case propounded in the beginning of that x Chapter, concerning a strong spot appearing as the german contract, and as the Ethiopian contract, *Rabbi Ismael* expoundes it of a middle colour neither white nor black but betwixt both;

x Ibid. sec.1.

R. Aki-

R. Akiba expoundes it of divers figures appearing about the ſpot both white and black, and of middle colour, &c. *R. Iehudah* hath yet an other expoſition, and their *chacamim* an other diffe-
y Sec. 2. rent from them all. Againe in the ſame y place, touching the canonicall houres before mẽtioned, *Rabbi Meir* notes them to be the third, the fourth, the fift, the ſixt, the ſeventh, the eight and the ninth houres; *Rabbi Iuda* notes them to be the fourth, the fift, the eight and the ninth; *R. Schimeon* in his gloſſe vpon the Thalmud in the ſame place notes the expoſition of *R. Ioſe* different from the former, namely that theſe howres were the fourth, the fift, the ninth and the tenth: and divers others ſuch like vanities & contradictions might be noted out of the ſame ſhort chapter.

Laſtly, for the thing that you would teach vs out of the Thalmud, & firſt for any wiſe man ſeing the plagne of leproſy, if you meane occaſionally as he meetes a leper, or as it is ſhewed vnto him, I deny it not; but if you meane that any wiſe man had authoritie to require an other to ſhew him his ſpot or plague ſuſpected, and to diſcover vnto him his nakednes whereſoever the ſpot was, eſpecially with ſuch a poſition of Body as the Thalmudiſts deſcribe, that remaines to be proved: and 2, for the adviſing of the Prieſt vpon occaſion to ſhut vp, or to pronounce clean or vnclean, I would eaſily have conſented vnto you therein, though you had not called for witneſſe vnto this Lying Thalmud.

Now whereas you adde: *yet none but the Prieſt himſelf might pronounce it vnclean or clean, Lev.13.3.4. Deut.24.8.* I anſwer.

Firſt, this is not altogather true, for though the ſcriptures alledged do ſhew that the Prieſts might do this thing and with more authoritie to be ſubmitted vnto, then other men ordinarily could do: yet do not theſe places ſhew that the Prieſt alone might pronounce a leper cleane or vncleane. For what law of God bindes a man from declaring the truth and pronouncing that to be clean or vncleane, which he certainely knowes by the word of God to be ſo? The high Prieſt and other Prieſts are com-

commanded to do many things which yet others might do alſo. And if the Prieſts wreſted the law, might not others declare and pronounce and practiſe otherwiſe? either you muſt grant this or els you muſt in part deſtroy againe that a proportion which yourſelf have made betwixt the Prieſts & Miniſters, Iſrael of old and the people of Chriſt now, for remooving the leper and putting away the wicked from among them. a Animad. verſ. p. 19. 20.

Secondly, for the application of this your aſſertion vnto the queſtion in hand, you ſhew it not at all: for what though none but the Prieſt might pronounce cleane or vncleane? yourſelf confeſs and teach that the work of ordination may be performed by ſuch as are no Miniſters and ſo you practiſe: how then do you draw this argument from the ſpecial miniſteriall power of the Prieſthood vnto ſuch an action as by your doctrine might be performed without either Prieſt or miniſter.

MY fift reaſon was taken from the mutuall & equall relation that is betweene miniſters and their people togather with your confeſſion that the members of one Church may lawfully vpon occaſion receive the Lords ſupper in an other Church from the miniſters thereof. This argument you deny. Your reaſons are: *The miniſters have a peculiar relation to their particular flocks onely, Act.20.28. Heb.13.13 17. 1 Pet.5.1.2.* I anſwer, 1. The people have a peculiar relation to their particular miniſters onely in like maner, and the places here alledged do ſhew a peculiar bond of ſubmiſſion whereby the people are in ſpeciall maner tyed vnto their owne overſeers that care for them and muſt give an account for their Soules more then for others. 2, as this peculiar relation of the people doth not hinder them from receyving the Lords ſupper at the hands of an other miniſter, ſo neither doth the peculiar relation of a miniſter vnto his flock hinder him from adminiſtring vnto others being vpon occaſion entreated therevnto. You ſay; *Apoſtles and all vniverſall miniſters are ceaſſed.* I anſwer that alſo an vniverſall people or members of an vniverſall viſible Church are ceaſſed; & yet as the combining of the people

vnto their owne peculiar miniſter doth not quite cut off their communion with other miniſters, ſo neither doth the reſtreyning of a miniſter vnto his peculiar flock quite cut him off frō adminiſtring vpon occaſion vnto an other people. Your ſimilitudes from *a huſband and a father* are againſt your ſelf: for as a huſband notwithſtanding his relation and bond vnto his owne wife, may yet become a [b] protectour and guide of the poore widow, that wants a huſband to perſorme theſe dueties: & as a Father notwitſtanding his relation vnto his owne Children & familie, may yet performe the work of a father vnto the poore and fatherleſſe: ſo likewiſe a ſheepheard or miniſter notwithſtanding the peculiar relation vnto his owne flock, may and ought vpon occaſion to performe the work of a miniſter vnto an other neighbour flock that have loſt their ſheepheard.

[b] Iob. 31. 16. 17. 18. & 29. 12. 16.

You ſay, *all circumciſed perſons, had right thereby* [c] *to eat the paſſeover in any ſocietie, in the place which God ſhould chooſe to put his name there: ſo all baptiſed perſons have right to the Lords ſupper, in every true church where God hath ſet his name.* I anſwer, 1. The ſcriptures alledged by you ſhew that circumciſed perſons had right to eat the paſſeover, but ſhew not that they had right to eat the ſame *in any ſocietie:* nay the place quoted by you ſhewes the cōtrary, for ſeing the lamb was to be eatē of the ſame houſhould, or if they were too few to eat it, thē onely others were to be takē vnto them, and thoſe alſo of their next neighbours, *Exod.* 12 4. and ſeing alſo that the paſſeover prepared was by order to be diſtributed [d] *according to the diviſions of the families of the Children of the people:* therfore ech perſon was bound to keep himſelf vnto his owne familie, and could not without diſturbance of this order intrude himſelf into any ſocietie. 2. This your comparing of the ſocieties where the paſſeover was eaten, with every true Church where the Lords ſupper is now adminiſtred, is very vnequall, and yet againſt your ſelf in the poynt of our controverſie: for theſe *ſocieties* had not ech of them their diſtinct and peculiar miniſters or Prieſts to adminiſter and prepare the paſchal-lambe for them, as ech true Church hath now their owne diſtinct officers: any Prieſt might indifferently prepare the paſſeover for many or any ſocieties, as well for one as an other: if then this type is to be our direction in the poynt of our differēce, any miniſter may now adminiſter the Lords ſupper vnto baptized perſons in any church.

[c] Exod. 12. 4. 48. Deut. 16. 1. 2.

[d] 2 Chron. 35. 11. 12. 13.

VVhereas you adde: *But the rulers of particular ſynagogues, had not the ſame authoritie in all ſynagogues, nor paſtors now in all flockes, &c.* I anſwer, 1. Though paſtours have not the ſame authoritie in all flockes yet this hinders not but vpon occaſion in time of need they being requeſted may help to performe ſome workes of a miniſter in an other congregation. 2, you make here an vnequal proportion betwixt rulers of the ſynagogues & paſtours of the churches now: for many rulers of the ſynagogues had not povver of adminiſtring the paſſeover even to any of their owne ſynagogue, for as much as we do not read that all the rulers of the ſynagogues were Prieſts who onely might ſprinckle the blood of the paſchall lamb according to the maner. 3, on th'other ſide ſome of the rulers of particular ſynagogues being Prieſts to teach and governe the people therein, had power alſo to adminiſter the Sacrament vnto them of other ſynagogues at the time and place apppoynted. 4, what know you but that the rulers of one ſynagogue had a hand in the governement of other ſynagogues alſo by the combination which was in that Church of the Iewes? How know you that either the Prieſts, Levites or other teachers were reſtreyned and bound to one ſynagogue and excluded from the governement of the reſt? If you vvill dravv proportions and patternes for vs from the rulers of the ſynagogues, ſhevv vs from the ſcriptures if you can, vvhat calling, election and ordination they had, whereby they vvere ſo ſtrictly tyed and reſtreyned vnto their ſeverall ſynagogues. The vvarrant vvhich I have already brought to ſhevv that the Elderſhip of one Church may vpon occaſion performe the vvork of ordination in an other, is not yet infringed by you: But vvhereas you require me to *ſhew*

that any elder ſhip may ordeine miniſters in their conſiſtories & ſend them as miniſters to other churches, &c. You aſk that vvhich is quite beſide our queſtion, and your groſſe errour therein vvith your falſe allegations for proofe of the ſame is to be ſhevved ſtraightvvay in that vvhich followeth.

VVnto my 6t argument taken from the common faith binding all churches, miniſters & people to performe all poſſible help for their mutuall ædification ſo far as they are not reſtreyned by ſome ſpeciall commandement of God: you give anſvver by ſhevving reſtreint from the ſpeciall ordinance of God, *Rev. ch.2. and 3. With Act. 20. 28. Heb. 5. 4.*, &c. Herevnto I reply:

1. As for *Rev.2. and 3. With Act.20. 28.* though the angels of the Churches be in ſpeciall maner bound to take heed vnto their ovvne flockes and particular Churches, yet doth not that charge reſtreyne them from taking heed vnto others vpon occaſiō for a time of neede. *The taking heed vnto their flocks* vvhich Paul requires in this place doth comprehend vnder it not onely the adminiſtration of Sacraments, ordeyning of miniſters & ſuch like actions, but alſo the adminiſtration of the vvord and prayers, godly counſell in private, &c: if then this *taking heed* muſt be reſtreyned vnto their owne particular Churches onely you may from hence as wel conclude that it is vnlawfull for a miniſter to make a Sermon or to call vpon the name of God in any congregation ſave his owne: ſeing both theſe kinds of ducties are in like maner included in this exhortation of Paul.

2. For *Heb.5.4.* This condemnes not thoſe that are deſired to help their neighbours in diſtreſſe, but thoſe that intrude themſelves without deſiring: Thoſe Churches that call or entreate a neighbour miniſter to help them vpon occaſion for a time, they give the honour vnto him, he takes it not vnto himſelf.

3. For both theſe places togather, *Act. 20. Heb. 5.* The Apoſtle ſpeakes in both of a miniſteriall charge & of an office, which every miniſter is to take heed vnto, and not to vſurp the ſame

ſame without a calling: But now yourſelf both by e writing & practiſe do confeſſe that this act of ordination may be executed and performed by ſuch as have no office or miniſterie in the Church, how then do you reaſon for a reſtraint from theſe places that concerne Officers, as though men vſurped an office and took honour vnto themſelves in performing ſuch a work as you grant may be done without any office?

e Animad. verſ p. 51. 52. 53. &c.

4. As for *2 Cor.10.13.16.* it ſhewes that men *may not boaſt of things without their meaſure, &c.* But, 1. it ſhewes not that thoſe which performe the work of ordination in a neighbour church deſired therevnto, are guilty of ſuch boaſting without their meaſure, in an other mans line, when as there is no other man in that congregation which is fit to performe the ſame, or willing to vndertake that worke. 2, this place doth rather reprove them as boaſters of things without their meaſure which being private men and alſo wanting the gifts of publique doctrine, exhortation & prayer do yet take the ſame vpon them, ſo as of neceſſitie they muſt do for the ordination of their miniſter or els have no miniſter at all ordeyned among them, whiles by your order you will not allow them to vſe the help of any other neighbour-miniſter or learned man. 3, ſeing the Apoſtle doth further declare his meaning in the ſame place: namely, that ſuch do ſtretch themſelves beyond their meaſure, which boaſt f *of other mens labours, and* g *of the things that are prepared already*: I wiſh you to conſider that thoſe which by their erroneous doctrine do ſeduce many ſimple people and draw them into their ſchiſme from thoſe that have bene the meanes of their converſion, if they be at all converted: thoſe I ſay boaſt of things without their meaſure & enter into the line of other men: thoſe are they that ſteale the Children out of the cradles, the Children for whoſe new birth they never travelled with paine: like vnto that h wicked woman that having overlayd her owne, did ſteale away an other ſonne from the boſome of the true and right mother. Think ſeriouſly with your ſelf Mr. Ainſworth, whether this be not your ſin.

f 2 Cor.10. 15.
g Ibid. vers 16.
h 1 Kin. 3. 19, 20.

5. VVhereas you plead from *Mat* 28.18.19. *Heb.*5.1.4. that *ordination is a work of power or authoritie, not given to one Church or minister over an other and therfore cannot by vertue of the common faith, be by them performed.* This is not contrary to that which I hold, for I sayd not that ordination might be performed by vertue of the common faith alone, I noted it to be a work of power and authority in the end of this 6t. reason before, when as I sayd it was *to be performed in the name of the Church that desireth help.* But a neighbour minister receyving povver and authoritie from the desire of those that seek his help, is then further bound by the common faith and generall bond of Christianitie to performe this service vnto those that need it. If you would have reasoned to the poynt, you should have shevved some reason why a Church cannot communicate this power vnto a minister or Prophet in an other congregation, as well as vnto a common member of their owne Church; especially when they want fit members among themselves to performe this worke.

6.c As it was before in generall observed, so here againe it is more particularly to be noted, that although so many transgressions be committed in the ordination of a minister: though he be ordeyned by such as are not appoynted therevnto of the Holy Ghost; though he be made a minister by such vsurpers as take this honour vnto themselves, when they are not called of God therevnto, as Aaron was: though he be ordeyned by them that want authority and power to do it; by them that boast of things without their measure, in an other mans line: yet do you notwithstanding this vnlavvfull ordination, (as you yourself reason against it) grant that it is not vnlawfull for any to heare such a minister so ordeyned. This being well considered vvill serve to overthrow many grounds of your separatiō. For as the i Rabbines from *Thorath Cohanim* describing the 4. sorts or degrees of that leprosy, which is called *Lebanah adamdemeth*, wherein the red colour is mixt with the vvhite, do note one to be greater then an other, comparing the first kinde to a Cup

i Maimony comment. in Thalmud tract. Negag. cap.1.sec.2 & R. Moses Kotsens. in SMG. Asin. 234.

a Cup of milk wherein are 2. drops of blood: the second to a Cup of milk wherein are 4. drops of blood; the third to a Cup of milk, vvherein are 8. drops of blood; the fourth to a Cup of milk wherein are 16. drops of blood: and yet in the discerning of these do account them all as one, and k give one judgement of them all, for the shutting vp, for the pronouncing of them vncleane, and for the purging of them: even so the vnlawfull ordination of ministers being in your account a sinfull transgression of Gods commandement, & consequētly an vncleane leprosy; if you were not now more partial then the Rabbines themselves, you would judge that one kinde of vnlawfull ordinatiō in the cup of any church should be a cause of separatiō as vvell as an other, though differing in degree, some Churches having more spots in their ordination, then some others have: especially considering that large pretence of *sin vnrepented*, which you alledge for a ground of your separation from vs, as I noted before. But for the present I vvill insist no further, reserving this observation vntill further occasion be given of applying it against your schisme & the grounds thereof.

k Thalmud Ibid. sec. 3.

AFter these reasonings against the right of ordination performed by the ministers of an other congregation, you come to speak of the fact it self as it vvas performed among vs in my ordination: and here you tell vs of your surmises and suspicions, as though our Church did not entreat the ministers of an other Church to performe it in their name, as I had intimated vnto you, &c. you say, you *have cause to doubt that the thing was not so caryed: both for that you have not heard that the ministers of the other Church, (being also of an other language) ever came into our publique congregation, (according to the lawes in your first reason alleged Exod. 29.4. Lev.8.3.4) to make publique prayers and to give exhortations, &c.* But to deliver you (if it may be) from your vaine coniectures and doubts, I vvill shevv you a litle more plainely and expressely the maner of my ordination, vvhich vvas this: Being elected to be pastour of this congregation by the free and voluntary consent and choyse of the members

bers thereof that had vnited themselves and agreed togather in the Lord for his service and their owne ædification, some of them were then appoynted by the rest to go vnto the Dutch Eldership in this citie and to desire both their counsell and help for my ordinarion. Herevpon, three reverend and learned ministers were deputed by the rest of their brethren to assist vs in this busines, namely *Mr. Plancius Mr. Helmychius* of blessed memorie who now resteth in the Lord, and *Mr. Lamere*, all which did also vnderstand the English tongue: these three tooke vnto them also by our desire a minister of the church of Scotland, *Mr. Dowglasse*, who being more able to speak in our language then they, did publiquely preach concerning the mutuall duties both of people and Pastour, and accordingly applyed his prayers vnto the action in hand. And herewithall did the ministers of the Dutch reformed Church at the same time give vnto me their right hands of fellowship in the middes of our people, and in the body of our publique congregation then assembled and prayed also for the blessing of God vpon this my calling. And this they did at that time of the first gathering & establishing of our church, not assuming authoritie vnto themselves over vs, but in our name and by our request: being now established when as of late an other minister was called vnto this our congregation, we vsed not their help herein as before, but his ordination was performed by our owne ministerie and Eldership without them.

After this surmise, you bring a notorious vntruth, and proceed from evill to worse, from a vaine coniecture vnto manifest falshood: when vnder colour of reason for your former guesse, you say, *as also becavse it is not their maner to ordeyn ministers publiquely in their owne Churches, it being by their canons to be doen in the Classicall assemblies or consistories.* Answer.

1 Synod in Graven-Haghe Año 1586. Art. 4. and Synod in Middleburgh. Año 1581. Art. 4.

First, it is an evident and open vntruth which you affirme touching their maner of ordination: And dayly experience beares witnesse against you: Their maner is to ordeyne ministers publiquely in their owne Churches.

Se-

Secondly, as for the canons of the two Synods which you suborne like tvvo false vvitnesses to prove your assertion, they are very iniuriously perverted and falsifyed by you. That 4th. article of the Synod holden in the *Haghe* Anno 1586 is directly against you, and in expresse words sheweth that the ordination of a minister lawfully called must be an **openlijcke bevestinghe voor der Ghemeynte** / that is to say: *an open or publique confirmation of him before the Congregation*: it shewes further how it is to be performed with convenient stipulation, questions, exhortations, prayer, &c. and againe it shewes that this ordination must be done, **naer het Formulier daer van zijnde**; that is, according to the forme which is prescribed for that purpose, which shewes more largely in what maner it is to be performed before the Church. In the end of that article, there is an exception touching the ministers which are to be sent out of their countrey into the enimies land, **inde Kercken onder t'Cruyce** / vnto the persequuted Churches, dispersed among the Papists in Colen, Antwerp, Brussels and such like places, where they have not such liberty for their solemne assemblies: but this concernes not the Churches in their owne country. As for the Synod in Midleburgh, Anno 1581. art. 4 neither doth it impugne their maner of ordeyning ministers publiquely in their owne Churches, but onely leaves it free: the vvords of the artickle are, **het zy in de Kercke openlijck ofte nae dat het gheleghen is inden Kercken Raet ofte Classe / doch altijdt met openbaere ghebeden** / that is to say: *either in the Church openly, or according as conveniency is, in the Consistory or Classis, but alwayes with publique prayer.* Besides, this Synod at Midleburgh being holden five yeares before that of Gravenhaghe, as the date shewes, is to be determined according to the later Synod, and therfore doth in no sort deny the publique maner of ordeyning ministers in the congregation. And further as appeares in the same book of their Synods, there was yet an other Synod holden at Midleburgh ten yeares after the former, agreeing vvith that of

m Synod in Middelburgh. Año 1591. Art. 5.

the Haghe also, whercin it is agreed that the m ministers after that they have bene propounded fourteene dayes vnto the congregation without any speciall contradiction shall then publiquely be confirmed in their ministerie, and this **naer het Formulier daer van zijnde** / which formulier, shewes the maner thereof more largely. And thus it may easily appeare how vnworthily you abuse the testimonies of Synods, by wresting them quite contrary to their meaning, and contrary to the truth. In the forefront of this your last n writing, you prefixe the saying of the Prophet Zacharie, *Love the truth, &c. Zach. 8. 19.* Hereby, *Truth* seemes to be as it were engraven vpon the lintell or vpper-doore-poste of your house, so that vnto those which passe by your porch, or draw neere to enter in, your building at the first sight seemes to be the *House of truth*; but vnto them that enter further to view what deceitfull work is in it, your building may then quickly be discerned to be the *House of falshood and forgerie*. Fie for shame, *Mr. Ainsworth*, that you will thus write either you cannot tell what, or you care not what. It is one of the foulest faults that we do justly complaine of in *Bellarmine* & *Baronius*, the Popish champions, that they do vnconscionably and falsly alledge many testimonies & matters of fact, and so joyne falshood with their errour; why feare you not to follow their crooked steps? It is great sin for any to speak vntruth in their owne name; but to make others guilty of vntruth, by perverting their testimonie to evill, is double iniquitie.

n Pag. 35.

Yet you insist still, and tell vs, that you *have heard it also testifyed, by some that have bene long members both of the Dutch and French: that they never did see the ordination of the ministers, though sundry were taken into office in their times.* But 1. I pray you who be those apocryphal witnesses that have thus testifyed vnto you? If they be such as dwell in this cirie or in the countrie adjoyning these may well bring vpon themselves the blame of being negligent and careless persons, who have no better observed the practise of their owne Churches: especially considering

ring that before the ordination of their ministers, their names are alwayes propounded vnto the congregation two or three Lords dayes before, that so ech member of the Church may take knowledge of that which is done. 2. Do you but look into the end of many Dutch Bibles where their forme of prayers and administration of the Sacraments is described, there may you finde the o *forme* of ordination according to the meaning of the Synods before mentioned: there may you see what their maner is, and that by the whole tenour of the words, as also by the titles or directions before them, the ordination of their ministers is performed in the middes of their whole congregation. How comes it that you who have lived more then 20. yeares as a neighbour vnto the Reformed Churches in these countries should yet be such a stranger vnto them and so ignorant of their estate and practise? 3. as for the French Churches here also, it is their maner likewise to ordeyne their ministers, Elders and Deacons in the publique congregation of the people: The deputies of their Churches were present at the generall Synod above mentioned holden in the *Haghe* Anno 1586, in the time of the earle of Leycester, by vvhose authoritye that Synod was also approved and confirmed: from thence they receyved the *formulier* of ordination before spoken of: and though they have not a forme printed with their Bibles as they Dutch have, yet do they keep it in writing and vse the same every yeare in the ordinatiõ of their Elders and Deacons: and of their ministers when they choose them, as in particular of *Monsieur Goulart*, *Morois*, *Bassecourt*, all which have bene publiquely confirmed in their offices before the people. And if this be not enough, I can yet bring you more plentifull witnesse, both to help & heale your incredulitie in respect of my estate, & to convince your false assertion, and false allegations in respect of the Reformed Churches.

o Forme van bevestinghe der Dienaren.

Finally, for conclusion of this matter, you inferre against vs from this plea, and ask, *how do you disable your owne church, & the the 3 other Elders that with you were authorized to feed your flock, as*

if there were not one amongst you, which could performe this Work of ordinattion, or ſhew the miniſter and people their mutual duetics?
Ianſwer.

1. Our Elders and people are not abaſed nor diſabled, when they profeſſe themſelves vnmeet to performe that work which God hath in no place exacted or layd vpon them. The work of ordination performed with publique preaching and prayer in the ſolemne congregation (as it ought to be) requires a ſpeciall gift of vnderſtanding and vtterance, as well as any other miniſteriall work that is to be executed in the Church of God. 2. Our Elders alſo and their gifts at that time were not ſo knowne and diſcerned, as ſiuce; they were not at that time choſen into office, neither were they ordeyned or *authorized with me*, (as your anſwer imports) but a good while after. 3. It had bene better alſo for your people, if they had not exalted themſelves ſo much as they have don, nor p exerciſed themſelves in things that are too hard for them: for example, your ancienteſt and buſieſt Elder *Iohn Decluſe* being once a member of the French church, affecting the office of the miniſterie, comes vnto the Elderſhip of that Church, and earneſtly deſires to have his gifts tryed: his deſire therein is granted, he is heard divers times and allowed to make propoſitions in their conſiſtory for tryall; but in fine after tryall, he is not allowed by them (though among you he is allowed to preach and Propheſie) they judge him vnmeete for ſo holy a work and that in divers reſpects; hereupon, and not before his diſcontentment appeares: he begins now to quarrel with the Church, and ſo in fine falles into ſchiſme, and renounces the communion of that Church and is receyved of you. How much better had it bene for him, to have kept himſelf within his meaſure, then thus to have bene diſabled by the Church of God? *Every man that exal-*
Luk. 18. 14 *teth himſelf, ſhalbe brought low.*

p Pſ. 131. 3, 2.

CAP.

CHAP. VI.

Touching ſeparation from ſuch as hold communion with the Church of England.

For your agreement with the Church of England I have ſhewed it to be more then you would pretend. Your members with you, diſclaime ſeparation from it: ſome of them have publickly renounced as moſt abominable, the covenant which we have made, in ſeparating from the ſynns of that Church, ſhewed in my former argument. As for your covenant which you mention, to ſeparate from knowen evils, and to ſerve the Lord in the Goſpel of his Son, ſo far as is revealed vnto you: they are but generals, ſuch as Arians, Anabaptiſts Papiſts, (and who not that profeſſe Chriſt?) will make alſo: that there can be no diſcerning, much leſſe approbation of your Church hereby. We have in our Confeſſion and Apologie, ſhewed the particular evils which we ſeparate from, and order in the Goſpel of Chriſt which we ſubmit vnto: till you do the like, we have no reaſon to approve of your Church: eſpecially knowing your oppoſition againſt vs, for the trueth which we profeſſe. Neyther ſeparate you from all knowen evils: for you have not repented of, and ſeparated from the falſe worſhip by humane leitourgies, or communion with the vnlawfull miniſterie and Church eſtate of the Pariſhes and Dioceſes in England, though they have ſo many yeares been convinced to be evil, before your eyes. Yea you, in this your plea, diſclaime not the authoritie and governement of the prelates as ſynfull ſimply, but in compariſon, as doe the Dutch and French churches: as if the arme of fleſh could not fayl you, or be faultie in approving that which is to be condemned. Yet is your compariſon vnfitt: for you were in your perſons, members of that church, & vnder the prelates rule, frō which your abiding for the preſent in an other lād freeth you not: ſeing all our ſynns remayn vpon vs, and we are tyed in their coards, til we break them off by q repentance and faith in Chriſt, vnto forgivenes, as I ſhewed before. Hen. Ainſ.

q Act. 20. 21. and 26. 18.

Answer.

Io. P. I Expected here some arguments to confirme the third mayne cause alledged to prove our Church falſe and our communion vnlawfull: In ſtead thereof you ſtill quarrel about the matter of fact how far we agree with the Church of England, but bring not one ſound reaſon to conclude a ſeparation from vs in reſpect of that agreement. And even about the matter of fact it ſelf, you deale very evilly in divers regards. 1. VVhereas I gave you 3 diſtinct anſwers touching the ſame: one part thereof you do quite omit, namely my ſecond anſwer, and ſay not a word vnto that wherein you were juſtly reproved: and the reſt you do confuſedly ſhuffle togather. 2. That your ſeparation, and covenant therein ſhould be diſclaymed as a moſt abhominable thing, I have alwayes profeſſed; and you haye not (as you affirme) ſhewed our agreement with England, to be more then I would pretend: Therein you ſpeak not truely 3. vvhereas you ſay of our profeſſion to ſeparate from knowne evilles, but not from the Churches of Chriſt for evilles among them, &c. that *they are but generalls ſuch as Arians, Anabaptiſts, (& who not that profeſs Chriſt?) will make alſo*; you offend divers wayes: for on the one ſide both you in your ſchiſme and many Anabaptiſts alſo will not make the like but the contrary profeſſion: you profeſſe that a *by communion with open wicked reteyned among them all are defiled*: The Anabaptiſts hold the ſame, and being refuted by Mr. Calvine, are herein defended by b H. Barow. The like profeſſion is made by Lemar the Arian, as is teſtifyed by divers: This being ſo, you did cunningly, but not honeſtly in the repetition of my words to leave out that part of them which might manifeſt this difference of our profeſſion, viz. *but not from the Churches of Chriſte for evilles among them*: On the other ſide there are ſome kinde of Arians, Socinians, Familiſts, Anabaptiſts, Libertines, Church-Papiſts who do not profeſſe ſeparation from knowne evilles, but are content to hold com-

a Apolog. pag 45. comm. of Sainſts, ch. 23.
b Diſcov. p. 33. 34.

communion with knowne evilles ſo deemed of them: ſo vntruely and inconſiderately you write in ech reſpect. 4, whereas you require vs to ſhew the particular evilles we ſeparate from, as you have done in your confeſsion and apology, &c. you do but trifle and hold off from the queſtion; for know you not that we are one with the Dutch Church, that we are a member of their Claſsis kept in this city: that we hold the ſame fayth deſcribed in the Belgique confeſsion printed long ſince: and that we ſubmit vnto the ſame order of governement with them? Doth it not hereby appeare vnto you, what particular evilles we ſeparate from? And what need we then to print any new confeſſions as you have done? If you obiect any difference in matters of leſs moment, you know them to be ſuch, as that you approve vs therein, rather then them. If you did not behold vs with a ſquint eye, theſe things would be plaine enough vnto you: but it is not without cauſe, which *Mr. Robinſon* in the refutation of your private ſchiſme, writes of you, concerning your looking at others c *onely with the left eye.* 5. That which you ſay of the worſhip, miniſtery and Church eſtate in England ſo many yeares convinced, &c. is but a falſe boaſting and flattring of your ſelf in vaine: I have before nominated vnto you divers treatiſes wherein your errours about theſe matters are refuted. 6. You do notoriouſly pervert my words, when you ſpeak of my *diſclayming but in compariſon, as do the Dutch and French Churches: as if the arme of fleſh could not fayle me, or be faultie in approving that which is to be condemned*: vpon theſe your words the reader which had not ſeene what I wrote, might be made to beleeve, that I had alledged the example of theſe Reformed Churches as an argument to juſtify our eſtate: but it is far otherwiſe: I ſhewed their practiſe to be the ſame with ours; onely to this end: that it might appeare how inexcuſably partiall you are that condemne vs as a falſe church, for that very thing which thoſe whom you do confeſſe to be true Churches, do hold as well as we. My words were plaine and I deſire the reader to mark them, and with all to judge how well

c Relig. com. p. 12.

well you cleare your ſelf of that partiality imputed : and whether my words have not bene vvrongfully vvreſted by you.

7. VVhere you ſay, my compariſon is vnfit, for that *We were in our perſons, members of that Church and vnder the Prelates rule*, &c. I anſvvere, ſundry people of our Church vvere never members of the Church of England, but came out of Scotland and from other places. Many members of the Dutch Church, have in their perſons bene members of the Church of England and vnder the prelates rule: yea ſome of them have bene miniſters vnto Engliſh congregations and vnder the prelates. Many yea and the greateſt part of our Church at the firſt gathering vvere ſuch as in their perſons were then members of the Dutch Church, and were from them tranſlated vnto vs with teſtimony of their ſound faith and godly converſation. Many that in their perſons were never members of the church of England may be as much and more guilty in approving the corruptions of that Church, then ſuch as have there lived vnder the rule of the prelates. How vaine then is that which yon except againſt my compariſon?

In the laſt place, you bring ſome colour of an argument againſt the lawfulnes of our communion: but it is far too light to prove vs a falſe Church. You ſay, *our abiding for the preſent in an other land, freeth vs not* [from the ſins committed in England] *ſeing all our ſynns remayn vpon vs, and we are tyed in their cords, till we break them off* d *by repentance and faith, &c.* This is that which you obiected e before, to prove that the reaſons directed againſt the Church of England, are againſt ours alſo: you ſay, vnto vs, *The remooving of our dwelling into an other land, remooveth not your ſins from you, nor you from them: it is your repentance onely and faith in Chriſte, that can purge away your ſins, Luk. 13. 3. 5. Mark. 1. 15 Papiſts that dwell here, in Englād or other where belong to the church of Rome, till they break off themſelves by repentance. Neither doth the abſteyning from the practiſe cleare the ſinner: for the guilt of Cayns Murder, cleaved vnto him all his dayes, becauſe he was not cleanſed by repentance and faith, although he never killed man more, after*

d Act. 20. 21. & 26. 18.

e Pag. 36.

after Abel. So though you here practiſe not the idolatries doen in England, yet in that you have practiſed them & not repented, your guiltines is vpon you, &c. I anſvver,

1. It is not our ſin in communion with, but your ſin in ſeparating from the church of England that is to be repented of. As you are refuted and called vnto repentance by *Mr Robinſon*, for one mayne part thereof, vvhile he hath convinced your more private ſchiſme: ſo are you by ſundry others for your publique ſchiſme. VVhen your ſeparation from our particular congregation hath bene vvell examined, I doubt not but your ſeparation from England alſo vvill thereby appeare in a great meaſure to be vnvvarrantable: and then the vvay being ſo prepared, my reſolution is (the Lord aſſiſting) if need be, to proceed further vvith you in ſhevving your ſchiſme from Englād. In the meane time it vvould but draw vs from the preſent controverſie.

2. If our communion vvith the Church of England vvere a ſin, yet is it not knowne ſo to vs; vve aſſure our ſelves of the contrary: all your obiections we judge to be vnſound. VVe repent vs of our knowne ſins: our ſecret ſinnes we know to be innumerable, and we endevour to be humbled for them: and beleeve that in Chriſt they are done away; So that if our communion with England were a ſin, yet are we not tyed in the cords thereof, as you teach. Nay your doctrine as it is applyed and maynteyned againſt vs, to the contrary, is a manifeſt and a maine hereſie, overthrowing the Goſpell, and the foundation of Chriſtian Religion both concerning faith and repentance in vs, and concerning the Merit of Chriſtes death & obedience. Vpon your reaſoning it followeth; that no Repentance and faith is accepted vnto ſatvation vnleſs there be a particular acknowledgment of all ſins diſputed againſt, as you have done againſt vs; that the Blood of Chriſte doth not cleanſe vs from al ſin: but that we are ſtill tyed in the cordes thereof, vntil there be a particular diſcerning and acknowledging of the ſame. This is contrary to the whole tenour of the Goſpell, declared in the

d Lev.9. 7. & 16.5-30 Iob 9 3. with ch.33 27.28. Esa.44 22. Ps.103. 3. Ioh.1.29. & 8.12. 1 Ioh. 1.7. 2 Pet. 1, 3. with 1.Cor.13. 9. & 3.1. 23. Philip.1,5. 9.

holy d scriptures: all which do shew that through faith in Christ we get remission of al our sinnes, even of those which through the great corruption of the flesh remayning even in the most faithfull, we cannot discerne often times, though the Lord for his part have given sufficient meanes to reveale and manifest the same vnto vs. VVhat avayleth it to say, that Christ dyed for sinners: while yon propound such a condition, and require such a repentance as no man can attayne vnto? God hath decreed to magnify the perfectiō of his grace in the imperfection of our faith and repentance: The infinite vertue and dignity of Christes divine nature appeares most gloriously, as in others so in this particular of giving merit vnto the sufferings of his manhood, to satisfy even for vnknovvne sins that are not particulerly and distinctly confessed & repented of. VVhat meane you then to maintaine such a fundamentall and pernicious errour as darkens the glory both of Christs person and office, and defaceth the nevv testament? vvith vvhat conscience can you say that vve are tyed in the cords of our sins, and are consequently to be reiected as a false Church, because vve repent not of an vnknovvne sin, vnknovvne to vs, and so controversall, that no minister of Chtiste on earth can discerne the same: you being the onely teacher that dare affirme such a thing?

3. Suppose vve vvere tyed in the cords of our sin, for vvant of this particular repentance, which you require: yet doth it not follovv that communion vvith vs is vnlavvfull: for the truth vvhich vve profess; for the true vvorship vvhich vve practise at this present; and at least for their sakes among vs, vvhich never vvere members of the Church of England, some favour and fellovvship should be yeelded vnto vs by you. Our Saviour hath taught vs to hold communion vvith vvicked men, for the godly sake that vvere among them: yea vvith such as vvere tyed in the cords of their sin, vvith such as did manifestly e Ioh. 8.21 53 with Luk. 22.7.8. e live and dy in their sinnes, vvithout repentance. VVhy do you then seek to lead men into the crooked path of schisme contrary to the example of Christe? As in the former answer the height

height of your heresy was discovered so in this the depth of your schisme is manifestly discerned, in calling men to separate not onely from the practise of sin, but also from the true worship of God, vpon pretence of some vnrepentant persons, which might pollute you with their fellowship therein. As for the scriptures alledged by you, viz. *Act. 20.21, and 26.18. Luk.13.5. Mark.1.15.* They shew indeed that men ought to repent, but there is not a word or syllable in them, that sounds to call vs vnto separation from such as do not repent. These scriptures are all abused by you: and touch not the question.

4. Consider how by this maner of reasoning you contradict yourself: for whereas you acknowledge the Reformed Churches notwithstanding your separation from them, to be f *true Churches & your brethren in Christe*, and yet by your profession hold them to be tyed in the cordes of their sin, because they do not repent of divers sins, which in your confession, dedicate vnto their vniversities, are cōvinced to be evill, as you imagine I would now know of you, why our want of repentance makes vs to be a false Church rather then them; especially, why more then the Dutch and French Churches of this city, whom you note to be tyed in many cords of sin, whiles you g charge them with the transgression of so many lawes of God, for vvhich they do not repent.

f Counterpo. p.49.

g Ans. to Th. wh. p.78,79.

5. Seing Mr. Robinson and his people do now (as divers of themselves confesse) receyve the members of the Church of England into their congregation, and this without any renunciation of the Church of England, without any repentance for their Idolatries committed in the Church of England: how can you hold them to be a true Church and communion with them lawfull: seing that by your reasoning they are tyed in the cords of their sin, as well as we; their guiltines is vpon them, though they have remooved their dwelling, and though they practise their Idolatries no more? At every turne your partiality appeares. Paul h charged Timothy before God, and the Lord Iesus Christe, and the elect Angelles, that he should do

h 1.Timo 5 21.

nothing partially: how litle do you regard this vehement obtestation? How will you answer it before the Lord and his Angels in that great day?

6. This your reasoning serves to bring confusion and dissipation vpon your owne particular Church: for it is manifest according to your owne profession that there are many knowne sins among you vnrepented off: and to omit a multitude of others which I could name, consider but these: It is well knowne that some of your people do heare sermons in Idol-temples as you call them, and though you plead against me, that this is a heynous sin, yet you do now suffer it practised among you. Your Elder *Iohn Declusse* alledged this among the rest for one cause of his separating from the french church, viz. *because they suffred the party innocent to reteyne the offendant that had committed adultery & to live still togather*: & heretofore (as you i confesse) it was the practise of your Church to excommunicate the innocent parties that would forgive the offendour either husband or wife vpon their repentāce in such case: since that time you cōfesse also that your judgemēt is altered touching this matter, yet so that *some of you are still perswaded* that your former judgement and practise was just. Of those that are so minded I ask how they can (according to your reasoning against vs) hold communion where such scandalles and abhominations as in their perswasion deserve excommunication, are yet openly tolerated without repentance. As for your Elder *Decluse* in speciall, if he be one of them that have altered his judgement, why doth he not acknowledge his fault vnto the French Church for alledging vnto thē such an vniust & vnsound cause of his separatiō from thē? If he have not chāged his judgemēt, how can he & the rest that are of his judgement reteyne fellowship, where judgement and and justice is openly perverted, where excommunicable crimes are contrary to the word of God covered & maintayned? vve have here just cause to speak vnto you as Barow doth to the ministers of England, even touching this very poynt, when he would show how ill they teach and keep the seventh

i Ans. to Th. wh. p. 32.

seventh commandement: he saith, k *And that your gravest and best conscienced preachers think not themselves in this case without blame, let them examine their corrupt consciences, how many of their cheef hearers and devout proselytes they know both men and women, that know such crimes ech by others, and yet for filthy lucre or fleshly respects continue together*. Are not their consciences rather most corrupt, that knowing such crimes by one an other, and holding them to be just causes of excommunication do hold with all that for crimes vnrepented & vnredressed men ought to separate, and yet contrary to their profession do live in a polluted society? May I not say vnto these men evē in your owne words Mr. Ainsworth, that l *if they which hold otherwise in judgement, shal yet let the true practise of the Gospell goe: posterity after them, being brought into bondage, may justly blame and curse them, that would not stand for the right*, &c. Further when Mr. Iohnson in his publique doctrine had expounded Mar. 18 17. contrary to your practise, and by many disputes had publiquely mainteyned his exposition, that he might quite subvert and change the forme of governement long practised among you: you tell vs that yet in end you offred vnto him before your parting, that m *notwithstanding your differences of judgement, you would continue together, if your former practise might be reteyned*: howsoever you cover the matter vnder the Phrase of *difference of judgements*, yet cannot you deny but that he openly taught false doctrine, and that in a matter of great weight: and that therfore he was tyed in the cordes of his sin, though he had absteyned from the practise of his doctrine; and yet signify that you are content to reteyne communion with an vnrepentant teacher of false doctrine. Your first offer being refused, you tell vs that then n *you desire of him, that you might have a praceable parting: and to be two distinct congregations, ech practising as they were perswaded, yet nourishing brotherly love and vnitie*. If your desire had bene granted, yet could you not deny, but that Mr. Iohnson and his people had bene tyed in the cordes of their sin; that their guiltines had remayned vpon them, both for false do-

k H. Barow discov. p. 182.

l Animadvers. p. 125

m Ibid. p. 123.

n Ibid. p. 126.

doctrine, change of your former governement, and great scandall which in your opinion followed therevpon, and yet with these vnrepentant Apostates, you professe to hold and nourish brotherly love and vnity: ô extreme partialitie in you, that are so ready to smother scandalles among your selves without repentance of the Authors thereof; and yet so far from nourishing brotherly love and vnity with other churches of Christe, whom you cannot with any colour accuse to be so deep in sin, by forsaking the truth formerly professed. Either repent of these offers, or els think, that according to your owne plea against vs, your owne people cannot with good conscience communicate with you, that mainteyne so great partialitie.

CHAP. VII.

Of temples: The first argument, examined.

Section, 1.

Hen. Ainsw. *FOr the Nunnes Chappel, (the place where you assemble,) you need serch no records: I hope you think Christ instituted no such Nunnes, Nunries, or Chappels for them: but that they belong to Satans synagogue, in what yeare soever they were founded. And*

a 1 Cor. 8. 10. *they being grosse idolaters, their chapel was an Idolie: (as the a Apostle nameth it,) or Idol house. And though themselves sayd no masse, yet were they partakers of the masse sayd by their Preists, and as is likely, within their own Cloyster, as was the custome in other Cloysters: and if not for that, yet for other false Gods it was erected.*

1. *To our first reason against the reteyning of them to be places wherein we should worship God, from Exod. 20. 4. 5. 6. With Deut. 12. 3. You answer six things.*

" *1. That the commandement in Deut. 12. was a temporarie ordi-*
" *nance, part of Moses politie now abrogate, &c. To prove this, you instance an other like law in Deut. 13. for destroying an apostate citie, with all the spoiles thereof, &c. not now in force.*

I answer, from our Saviours testimonie, that he came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfyl it, Mat. 5. 17. so that such judicials as appertayned

teyned to the moral law written on the Tables, and are of common equitie to all nations, are not by Christ abrogated, touching the substance of them. Such is this law, perteyning to the 2. Commandement, and it is of common equitie to all nations for to shun b *idolatrie: therfore it is not abrogated by Christ. And I adde, touching the substance of them: because you insist vpon such manner and meanes as were then vsed. For there might be some manner and meanes then vsed, which I say not that Magistrates are now bound vnto: as that all such malefactors as were then to be stoned, must be stoned now, and may dye no other death. There were lawes in Israel, to cut off murderers, adulterers, and other flagitious: yet some things perteyning to murder and adulterie, were peculiar to that land and people, as cities of refuge, Num. 35. the expiation of murder when the Author was not knowen, Deut. 21. And so for the manner of punishing adulterie, by stoning, Ioh. 8 5. by burning, Lev. 21 9. or other wayes. Now I suppose you hold, that murderers and adulterers are by vertue of Gods law at this day to dye: & yet you wil not affirme that they must dye onely after that manner that was in Israel. Even so do I hold touching Idolaters and Idol temples.*

b 1. Cor. 10. 14. 1. Ioh. 5. 21 Rev. 18.

To your instance from Deut. 13 I answer, that it followeth not if an other law be all or any part of it abrogated, therfore this also in Deut. 12. is so likewise: as the law for a murderer to dye, is not now abolished because of that law in Deut. 21. Secondly, you shew no reason why that law in Deut. 13. should not now stand in force: the inconvenience which you object of thousâd thousands of people at this day, vnder that iudgement, is but a supposition. I presume rather on the contrary, that you cannot name one citie at this day in the world, lyable to that iudgement: but that manifest difference may be put in sundry things, from the plaine words of the law, & the common exposition of the Hebrewes concerning the same. Thirdly, if any ceasing of that law be at this day urged, it cannot in equitie be for the idolaters them selves, or any instruments of their idolatrie, but onely for their civil goods, wherof there is no question between you and me. And for particular idolaters which were to dye, as their goods were c *not unlawfull: so the Hebrewes hold, that if any of those cautions*

c Deut. 17. 2-7.

fayled

fayled which Moſes expreſſeth in Deut. 13. The perſons that ſynned, were to be ſtoned as particular perſons, and d their goods went to their heires, *& ſo were not deſtroyed with them. Fourthly, if the judicial law againſt idols & idolaters be abrogated; then alſo againſt blaſphemers, murderers, &c. Which is the opinion of the Anabaptiſts, who would take the ſword from the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, upon this erroneous opinion that the judicials of Moſes are at an end. They have all a like authoritie; & the aboliſhing of one that is of perpetual equitie, overthroweth all. But th' Apoſtle telleth us* e *that the Magiſtrate hath the ſword, & is Gods Miniſter: therfore he is to uſe his ſword according to the will of God; & that will is not to be found, but in the iudgments given by Moſes. How ſhould th' Magiſtrate puniſh malefactors lawfully, vnleſſe he doe it of faith? for whatſoever is not of faith is ſyn. And how ſhould he do it of faith, vnleſſe he haue the word* g *of God authorizing him? And where is the word that authorizeth him to kil murderers, adulterers, buggerers, blaſphemers &c. but in the Iudicials of Moſes? It is alſo the doctrine of the Church of England that the Chriſtian Prince* h *hath the charge of both Tables of the Law, committed to him of God; & for his power to aboliſh poperie, it is by them alleged how God by his Prophets often & earneſtly commanded the Kings to cut down the groves, &c. yet you wil not admit of the ſame reaſon now brought by us; but put it off as a temporary precept, and abrogated by Chriſt.*

d Maimony treat. of Idolatrie, c. 4.

e Rom. 13.

f Rom. 14. 23.

g Rom. 10. 17.

h Apologie (By B. Iewel) c. 11. diviſ. 2.

i Ibidem diviſ. 3.

Anſwer.

Ioa. Pa.

IN this your declaration of the Idolatrous vſe of the place, wherein we meet for the true worſhip of God, we may obſerve: 1, the guiltines of your former writing; your preſumption in affirming you knew not what; in ſaying our Chappel was *built for the breaden God and other Idolles*; your ſelf do now ſeeme to ſtagger about it: you now come to ſpeak of likelyhoods, & with ifs: *if not for that, yet for other falſe Gods, &c.* but *if not for that*, then was your former aſſertion falſe. You ſay, I *need ſerch no records*: If I had that faculty of preſuming to ſpeak

ſpeak of things vnknowne, as you do both touching true Churches, as before in the matter of ordinatiō; & touching the building of Popiſh Churches as here and afterwards againe, then would I not much ſtand vpon the teſtimony of any records; but love of truth and ſobrietie teach men otherwiſe: 2, even in likelyhood, whereof you ſpeak; this Chappel was not built for the worſhip of the breaden God in the Maſſe; for beſide the teſtimony of thoſe that keep the evidence of this building, whereof I ſpake before; there is this teſtimony in generall touching Chappelles: o *Capellæ ab initio, nihil aliud quam oratoria ſine miſſa*: that at the firſt, they were nothing els but oratories or places of prayer without the Maſſe: and if this were true touching other Chappels at the firſt building and erecting of them, much more in likelyhood for this, where their ordinary devotions were to be performed, not by a Prieſt, but by the women themſelves, that lived alone. 3, note the idlenes of that which you ſay, touching their Idol-worſhip: ſeing I granted ſo much before, and therevpon condeſcended to come vnto the anſwer of your reaſons againſt ſuch places of worſhip, after that the Idolatrous vſe is remooved. As it is preſumption to affirme that which you cannot prove, ſo is it vaine and idle, to inſiſt vpon that which is at firſt yeelded vnto you. 4, though I think (as you hope) *that Chriſt inſtituted no ſuch Nunnes, Nunries or Chappelles for them*, &c. yet let vs not make them worſe then they are: It is ſin to p accept the perſon of God: and therfore on the contrary alſo a ſin to talk wickedly or deceitfully againſt the Idolatours themſelves. Thus therfore I hold of them, that their principal evill, (ſo farre as they were Nunnes, and diſtinct from other Idolatrous people one with them in their common faith,) was their *Separation*: This Separation was double, in the worſhip of God, having their Chappels apart from others; and in ſingle life, having their Cloyſters apart from the company of men. And yet in both theſe reſpects, I hold that the new Monkes and *Nunnes* of your ſeparation are more to be condemned, then theſe *Nunnes*, whoſe Chappel we do now vſe.

o Hoſpinian. de orig. temp. lib. 3. cap. 2.

p Iob. 13. 7, 8, &c.

For first, these Nunnes, though they worshipped apart from those that were of the same faith with them, yet did they this without renunciation and condemning of others, but approved them as lawfull worshippers of God; you on the contrary in your Monastery separate with renunciation from those that are of the same faith with you, and leave their worship as a polluted thing in all Churches save your owne. Againe, for separation from mariage, this kinde of Nunnes, whose chappel we have, were not so bad as other sorts of them. This order of Nunnes, being called *Bagines* were not bound by vow vnto single life, as other orders of them were: q *Beguinæ sunt mulieres religiosæ, nullo voto astrictæ, in sacro mulierum contubernio viventes, quandiu illis gratum est.* And besides this generall and publique evidence, touching this order, we have also more particular testimonie touching the Nunnes of this place, for the confirmation hereof: But on the contrary the Monkes and Nunnes of your separatiõ have a greater necessity layd vpon thẽ, touching Mariage, and are not so free: your people are not allowed to mary with any godly person either in the Church of England, or yet in these reformed Churches: but you have excommunicated divers of your people for marying with the members of the Dutch Church in this citie: These *Baguines* were free to mary when they would and to whom they would of their owne faith, But in your Cloyster of the separation there is far greater bondage: no permissiõ to mary with those that are of the same faith, except they be of the same *Order* with you.

q Etymolog. Teutonic. in vocabulo. Beghijne.

TO come now vnto your first argument: my first answer was that the commandement *Deut. 12.* vvas *a temporary ordinance, &c.* Your reply is, that *Christ came not destroy the law but to fullfill it, Mat. 5. 17. so that such iudicialles as appertcyned to the morall law written on the Tables and are of common equity to all nations are not by Christe abrogated touching the substance of them. Such is this law perteyning to the 2. Commandement, and it is of common equitie vnto all nations to shun idolatrie: therfore it is not abrogated by*

1 Cor. 10 14. 1 Ioh. 5. 21. Rev. 18.

by Christe. Vnto this argument I answer.

1. Your marginall quotations of scripture, do not prove that the commandement of destroying Idolatrous places is of common equitie to all nations: though they teach vs to shun Idolatrie. Can not idolatrie be shunned, vnless the places be destroyed? This you ought to have proved: This is the poynt: this you leave as you found. You knew well enough before, that we grant Idolatrie is to be avoyded, but how do you thence conclude the destruction of the place? Your pretended *common equitie* being applyed vnto the places and buildings themselves is against common sense, and not a word to colour the same, in any of these allegations.

2. vvhereas you adde that the judicialles *touching the substãce of thẽ* are not abrogate: & yeeld vnto me that Magistrates are not now bound vnto the same *maner and meanes,* &c. you do herein yeeld me the question: and all your instances from *Numb. 35. Deut. 21. Ioh. 8. Lev. 21.* 9. do serve for the further declaration hereof. For the maine equitie and substance of that commandement *Deut. 12.* is to shun idolatrie: the ceremoniall maner and meanes were by destroying and abolishing the places and buildings: even as the substance of that law *Numb. 35.* for defence of the innocent that killes an other against his vvill, is perpetuall, but the respect of the place, to be fled vnto at that time, doth now ceasse: And what is more peculiar vnto the *maner and meanes* of any action, then respect of the place: either places prohibited or places commanded? As the holines of places commanded by law, doth now ceasse: so the vnlawfulnes of places prohibited by the same lavv, doth in like maner ceasse.

3. VVhereas you graunt that Magistrates are not bound vnto the same maner and meanes, in their execution of judgement, as by the same kinde of death, by burning, stoning, &c & yet hold vvith all, that he cannot do any thing herein of faith, vvithout the vvord of God authorizing him: I vvould knovv of you vvhich be those places of scripture, that do novv authorize

rize a Magiſtrate to put a malefactour to death , by any other kinde of death, then thoſe that are peculiarly noted in the law: vvhen you have nominated ſuch places to allow a change of the puniſhments, you ſhall then finde that the very ſame places will alſo give vs allowance to ſhun Idolatry , without deſtroying and aboliſhing the places according to the maner and meanes in Iſrael. Forget not to prove this which I ſay vnto you , as a ſpeciall help to bring you to the ſight of your errour.

1. Annot. on Exod. 21. 25.

4. Yet let me here warne you of your too much renclining to the Rabbines opinions , that allow the commutation or chang of corporall puniſhments for money, vſing great indulgence & giving diſpenſations therein, in any of thoſe caſes *Exo.* 21.24.25. excepting onely life for life, and this even vnder the law it ſelf. About this poynt you ſeeme to erre doubly, both in aſcribing a contrary opinion to the Sadduces, which you know not: but it was as well the opinion of the Phariſees, conſidering *Mat. 5. 20. with 38.* as alſo in preferring the worſe opinion: though our Saviour require private men to forgive one another yea for life it ſelf taken away, yet this was no warrant for judges in publique to change corporall puniſhments for money. VVhen you bring grounds out of the new teſtament for the change of puniſhments, ſeek better then ſuch.

For explanatiō of my former anſwer, I gave inſtance in a like example, *Deut. 13.* wherevnto your firſt reply is: *that it followeth not, if an other law be all or any part of it abrogated, therfore this alſo in Deut. 12, &c.* Herevnto I anſwer, 1. you might and ought to haue conceyved of that inſtance not as of a new argument by it ſelf to prove the abrogation of that law in *Deut.* 12. but onely as of an illuſtration to make my anſwer more plaine and evident: conſidering the phraſe I vſed in alledging it thus, *for example: As God, &c.* 2. Seing there is the like reaſon and conſequence of things that are of like nature: though it follows not that the like law of killing the murdrer is diſanulled , becauſe the law of expiation in Deut. 21. is aboliſhed: the one of theſe laws

lawes being ceremoniall, th'other not: yet becauſe the lawes in *Deut. 12. and 13.* are both of them ceremoniall , apperteyning vnto the *meanes and maner* of ſhunning Idolatrie, they are therfore both of them by the like conſequence to be held abrogated, ſo far as concernes the deſtruction of places, buildings, &c.

Your ſecond reply vnto that inſtance in *Deut. 13*, is: that *the inconvenience which I obiect of thouſand thouſands of people at this day, vnder that iudgement; is but a ſuppoſition:* that you *preſume rather on the contrary , that I cannot name one citie this day in the world, lyable to that iudgement, &c.* I anſwer.

1. You alter my words: I obiected not that thouſand thouſands of people at this day were vnder that judgement, Deut. 13. whatſoever I might have done: but I ſayd that *the goods* of ſo many perſons ſhould be *avoyded as execrable things*, &c. if that law were in force. This might be, though ſo many perſons were not guilty of that ſin, nor lyable vnto that judgement: ſeing the goods of one apoſtate citie being diſperſed abroad into many cities might make their riches vncleane alſo, & vnlawful for vſe, ſo that mē ſhould not know how to traffique ſafely with them, either by buying, ſelling, &c. for feare that ſome of the execrable goods might cleave vnto their hands.

2. I marvell that you who have ſo often ſtumbled vpon *Roome* when you ſhould not, do now remoove it ſo far out of your ſight: To omit other Chriſtian cities which have degenerate from Chriſtianiſme to Turciſme and Heatheniſme: that Idolatrous and apoſtate *Roome* is the citie which I name vnto you, as lyable vnto the judgement Deut. 13. if that law were ſtil in force. Shevv a difference from the plaine vvords of the lavv as you ſpeak, if you can. As for the common expoſition of the Hebrewes, whereof you alſo ſpeak, they are contrary to the law of God and not worthy to be mentioned.

Your third reply is, *if any ceaſing of that law be at this day vrged, it cannot in equity be for the Idolaters themſelves, or any inſtruments of their Idolatry, but onely for their civill goods, &c.* I anſwer,

1. If that law be ceaſſed for civill goods, then for the buildings and temples likevviſe which are the civill goods of men; even as the Chappel which we vſe is a part of the Magiſtrates civil goods, and by them lent vnto vs. The vſe which vve have of them in Gods vvorſhip hinders not but that they are our civil goods: even our Bibles though vve have a religious vſe of them both in publique and in private worſhip of God, are yet a part of our civill goods alſo. Your meeting houſe ſerving for your religious exerciſes in publique, is it not a part of your civil goods? Vnleſs you did vſe this plea before the Magiſtrates in your ſuites about the ſame, I think you vvould not long enioy the ſame.

2. If this law ceaſſe onely in reſpect of civill goods, then vvhat ſhall become of infants and other litle Children, the inſtruments of Idolatry with their parents? Are the Magiſtrates bound to ſlay them with their apoſtate parents, as your Iew doctours would have it? Deut. 7. 18.

3. VVhereas you ſay that *the goods of particular Idolaters which were to dy, were not vnlawfull:* VVhat reaſon have you ſo to interpret that law, *Deut* 17. 7. vvhich maketh no mention of his goods at all? And if the particular Idolater did alſo ſeek to ſeduce others ſhould not the equity and proportion of the former law in *Deut.* 13. 17. be regarded? or ſhould the greater ſin have the leſſer puniſhment?

4. VVhereas you runne for help to *Maimony* your fellow labourer, and alledge the opinion of the *Hebrewes holding that if any of thoſe cautions fayled* vvhich Moſes expreſſeth, &c. You do hereby incurre the blame which you do ſo often impute vnto others: you make fleſh you arme, vvhich yet can not ſave you. For 1. The Cautions which the Iewiſh expoſitors do obſerve from *Deut.* 13. touching the apoſtate city to make it lyable vnto the judgement there ſpecifyed, are moſt vaine and abſurd, as may be ſeene in the commentarie of *R. Solomon* vpon that place: yet your t *Maimony* goes far beyond him, even in the ſame chapter alledged by your ſelf, where he writes that the apoſtate city

t Miſneh. tract. abodah zarah, ſive de Idolat. Cap. 4.

city doth not come within compaſſe of that judgement: vnleſs the perſons ſeducing the ſame were *two or more then two:* vnleſſe the perſons ſeducing were *men and not vvomen:* vnleſſe they were *men and not Children:* vnleſſe the ſeducers were *of the ſame citie and of the ſame tribe:* vnleſſe the perſons ſeduced vvere *an hundred or vpward*: And a number of other abſurdities might further be noted out of the ſame Chapter, vvhich you might vvell be aſhamed to mention, for had you acquainted the readers therevvith, they might eaſily have diſcerned, that your vvitneſſes vvere not vvorthy to be heard. 2. As the Ievviſh expoſitions are vaine in themſelves, ſo are they alſo contradictory vnto one an other: vvhere as *Maimony* requires *a hundred* perſons to be ſeduced, for one condition of this apoſtaſy: *R. Ioſias* (as *R. Moſes mikkotſi* recordeth) requires but *ten* & vpward: and many other cautions are there omitted alſo. 3. vvhat if the goods of theſe apoſtates vpon the want of any of theſe cautions, did paſſe vnto their heires, as the Rabbines vvould have it? This helpes you nothing, nor yet hurts me at all, vvhiles I ſpeak of the city apoſtate according to the conditions expreſſed by Moſes. u in SMG. præcept affirm. 15.

Your fourth reply is: *if the iudiciall law againſt Idols and Idolaters be abrogated: then alſo againſt blaſphemers, murderers, &c. vvhich is the opinion of the Anabaptiſts, who vvould take the ſvvord from the Chriſtian Magiſtrates, &c.* I anſvver.

1. In this ſuppoſition you ſeek to encroach vpon me, as though I had maynteyned that the judiciall lavv againſt Idolaters vvere abrogated: vvhich is not our queſtion, but onely vvhether the places of Idol-vvorſhip, are of neceſſity to be aboliſhed: There may judgements of God be executed by Magiſtrates vpon Idolaters to the rooting out of falſe vvorſhip, though ſome of the places be converted vnto the vſe and benefit of the Church in the true vvorſhip of God. Here therfore you turne quite out of vvay.

2. If the judiciall lavv againſt Idolaters be not abrogated: then think ſeriouſly and conſider vvhether you yourſelf for your

your former Idolatries be not the Childe of death appoynted to dye by the hands of the Magistrate : I meane for your apostasy (after separation) vnto the Idol-worship of the Church of England, which according to your profession and judgement declared in your writings, is a most horrible and heynous Idolatry: This judiciall law of Moses doth not allow any repentance vnto the Idolatour, more then to the murderer , to save him from death of the body : and therfore you cannot plead that you are freed from the guiltines of death , thereby. If you can finde out any other distinction, excuse or plea for the saving of your owne life from the sword of Moses judiciall lavv : you shall then finde out and shew vs such distinctions, as will serve to frustrate & put away many of your owne obiections against vs in sundry poynts: see therfore that you do not sleightly passe over this matter.

3. VVhereas you say, touching the vse of the sword that *the Will of God, is not to be found, but in the judgements given by Moses:* & againe aske vs, *Where is the Word that authorizeth the Magistrate to kill murdrers, adulterers, buggerers, blasphemers, &c. but in the iudicialles of Moses?* It is yourself that by these erroneous speeches do exceedingly gratify the *Anabaptists* : for howsoever the law of Moses doth afford sufficient warrant to put these malefactours to death : yet the most pregnant and evident determinations of the judiciall law, are those places of the new testament which do expressely and particularly shew some of them to be of perpetuall equitie : for example , touching ech of the malefactours here named by your self, there is speciall warrant in the Gospell to execute judgement vpon them: on [x] murdrers on [y] adulterers, and buggerers: on [z] blasphemers, and Idolaters: for vnto such the Lord threatneth vengeance , and calles the Magistrates to execute his will vpon them : And thus hath Christe declared his will vnto vs & hereby authorizeth the Iudges and princes of the earth to root out evill from among men: they have not onely a general warrant to vse the sword, *Rom. 13* as you alledge: but they have also these particular directions to shew

x Mat. 26. 52. Rev. 13. 10 & 18. 20.
y Rev. 11. 8 & 9. 21.
z Rev. 13. 5, 11. & 17. 3. 4. 5. compared with Rev. 14. 14--20. & 17. 1. 16 & 18. 6. 7. & 19. 17. 18.

shew them the severall causes for which they are to draw their sword: And therfore while you deny these most sure warrants, & grounds of faith for the Magistrate to proceed by , sending him onely vnto the judicialles of Moses , you do hereby give great advantage vnto the *Anabaptists*, and take away from the Church of God the principall weapons whereby they should convince those heretiques and defend the authoritie of Christian Princes against them.

4. VVhereas you alledge *the doctrine of the Church of Engl*ād. I grant the same: that the Christian Prince hath *charge of both tables* of the law, and that Deut. 12. may be alledged for the *abolishing of popery*: I shewed before that the equity of that cōmandement leads vs to the detestation of Idolatry ; and consequently of popery : yet doth it not follow that it bindes vs to the same maner and meanes of detestation, in ech ceremony & circumstance of place, time , &c. These ought to have bene distinguished by you.

5. Suppose that our temples were to be pulled downe by the Magistrate in the same maner that was observed vnder Moses policie; and that the Magistrates did offend in reteyning them : yet where is your warrant, for such an offence of the rulers to separate from the worship of God in those temples ? I call for your proofe herein: I pray you set it downe plainely & fully. This concernes the poynt of separation and ought to be insisted vpon more then many others.

Section 2.

YOur 2. exception is , that God commands to abolish their names also , Deut. 12. 3. But we finde Idolatrous names reteyned vpon sundry persons: Rom. 16. Phil 2 Tit 3, &c. Hen. Ainf. ,, ,,

I answer : First then it seemeth you hold, that Magistrates are neyther bound to abolish idols, nor the names of false Gods out of their dominion : seing the law in Deut. 12. which commandeth to destroy such, is in your judgement abrogated. Wherin you come short of the

Zele which is sayd to have been in P. Silvester the first that he a abhorring the memorial of the vaine gentile Gods, decreed that the dayes of the week which had afore the names and titles of the Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercurie, &c. should be called the first, second, third, fourth ferie (or day of the week) in semblable maner as the Iewes (from Gods warrant Gen. 1.) counted their dayes from the Sabbath day. Contrary vnto you, I hold that law in Deut. 12. moral and perpetual, both for false Gods, and for their Name. For as the Church of old, b changed the idolatrous names of Nebo, and Baal-meon: so God promised, c to take away the names of Baalim out of his peoples mouth, that they should be no more remembred by their name. It is also prophesied of Christ (in Psal. 16. 4.) that he should not take vp the names of such, into his lips. Moreover, all vncleannes should d not once be named among the saincts: and if not bodily vncleannes, neyther spiritual, which is idolatrie. Secondly, for the meaning of that law in Deut 12. 3. I vnderstand it not to forbid absolutely all naming of false gods; seing Moses and the Prophets doe vsually and lawfully name e Baal peor, Chemosh, Ashtaroth & other idols: but such naming, or reteyning of their names, as tendeth any way to the vpholding of their superstition. Even as on the contrary, by the putting of the true Gods name in any place, Deut. 12. 5. is meant the placing of his Religion and ordinances. And as Rabshakeh honoured not the true God, when he called him by his name f Iehovah: so neyther did the Prophets honour idols, or syn against the Law in Deut. 12. 3. when they mentioned their names which were set vpon g places, h temples, and i persons of men. So then for your allegation of names mentioned by the Apostle; First how prove you that those names, were at first given them in any respect of honour to the idols of the heathens? If you say, the notation of their names sheweth it: that say I is insufficient. For why may not Hermes in Rom. 16. 14. have his name of Hermes Trismegistus the Philosopher, as wel as of Hermes the God Mercurie? Or, without respect of eyther of them, of the notation of the name, an Interpreter? Why should Phœbe in Rom. 16. 1. have reference to the heathen Goddesse, rather then to the Moon, or to the signification of the word, which is Chast, or Pure; and which might in that respect, by

a Polydore Virgil. l. 6. c. 4.

b Num. 32. 38.

c Hos. 2. 17

d Eph. 5. 3.

e Numb. 25 3 & 21. 29 Iudg 2. 13. and 11. 24.

f Esai. 36. 7 10.

g Deut. 3. 29.

h Esai. 37. 38.

i Dan. 5. 26 & 4. 8 9. 19

be a common name to many women? We finde that Bel or Beel, Was the name of an k Idol: and in Beel-zebub it is the name of a false God, 2. King. 1. 2. But when David named his Son l Beel-jada; Wil you say he had reference to any idol: or rather simply to the common vse and signification of that word? So for our times, you will not I hope deney but the Papists syn against Exod. 20 and Deut. 12. whiles they make and mainteine images of S. Peter, S. Paul, S. Iames, &c. and erect temples to their honour, and name them S. Peters Church, and the like. Yet when men give their Children civil names, of Peter, Iames, &c. must they needs herein communicate with the Papists idolatrie? Or when a man is named George, must this name respect S. George the old idol of England and if we lived vnder Moses politie, would you say men synned against Deut. 12. 3. in giving such names: yea that whosoever calleth them by those names which their parents gave them, did break that law in Deut. 12? Wherfore it is yet for you to prove, that Paul in mentioning Phœbe, Hermes, and others by their common knowen names, did contrary to that commandement in Deut. 12. 3. if it stand in force at this day. Againe, the offices and names of Pope, Abbot, Monck, Frier, &c. are Antichristian, and to be banished out of Christs Church, (as the name m of the Chemarims,) so that none of his ministers may in respect of their offices, be named a Pope or an Abbot, a monck or a frier: I hope you wil not deny this. How be it, such ministers as have their civil names Pope, or Monck, or Abbot or Frier; may lawfully reteine and be called by those names: yea though we were vnder Moses law, which you think is abrogated.

k Esai. 46. 1

l 1 Chron. 14. 7.

m Zeph. 1. 4

But were it certaine, and so granted that those in Rom. 16, &c had their denomination of heathen Gods: it followeth not, that the law in Deut. 12. 3. forbiddeth to mention them by their names: for Daniel was named Beltesshazzar, n according to the name of Nebuchadnezars God: yet the Prophet mentioneth this his own name, and the names of o Shadrach, Meshach & Abednego, which were likewise idolatrous. So he speaketh to Nebuchadnezar, and to Belsshazzar (named of their Gods p Nebo and Bel,) and calleth them by those names Dan. 2. 28. & 3, 16 & 5. 18. 22. Now Daniel who was so godly, as he would not break the ceremonial law of Moses in meat and drink,

n Dan. 4. 8.

o Dan. 2 49 & 3. 16. 23 & 4. 19.

p Esai. 46 1

Dan.1.8. would not have mentioned these idolatrous names, if that had been the meaning of the law in Deut.12.3. Which you would enforce. So this your 2. reason doth not yet prove that law to be abrogated.

Answer.

Io. Pa. VNto my second answer touching the names of divers Idolles reteyned in the persons therevpon denominate in the new Testament, as the names of *Mercury, Venus, Phœbe, Iupiter, Apollo, Fortuna, &c.* your first reply is, that *then it seemeth I hold, that Magistrates are neither bound to abolish Idols, nor the names of false gods out of their dominions, &c.* I answer.

1. It is not altogather as it seemes vnto you: though I hold that law in *Deut.12.* to be abrogate as touching the strict maner and meanes of abolishing Idolatry, yet hold I also that the equity of the same law teacheth Magistrates, to abolish both names and other monuments of Idolatry so far as they are not of necessary vse: my exception in this place was not of the Magistrates duety, but of the peoples reteyning of these names, opposite vnto your opinion, vvho teach that both Magistrates are still bound to destroy, and people also to forsake those things mentioned in Deut.12. vvhereas on the contrary I shew that the saincts and faithfull brethren in the new Testament did not forsake but still reteyned and caryed the names of divers Idolles.

2. VVhereas in this first reply you obiect the testimony of *Polydore Virgil*, and the example of *Pope Sylvester*, saying, that *I come short of the zeale which, &c.* You do here againe make flesh your arme, as before the flesh of the Infidel Ievves for your right arme, so here the flesh of blinde Papists for your left arme which you stretch out against me: but 1. as for *Polydore* know you not that he is a fabulous writer, full of falshood and forgery? read but those things that go a litle before, or follow after this allegation which you bring from him and you shall easily discerne

discerne the same; besides other manifold instances that might be brought for proofe hereof: what meane you then to bring such notorious lyars for your witnesses? yea even in his story of this Pope in particular, he is taxed by a better historians as a flatterer of this *Sylvester*, as *the popes parasite*, &c. 2. As for *Sylvester* himself, neither do I come short of his zeale, for though I hold that private Christians are not bound now to change their names, (no more then your *Sylvester* a member of your Church, though this his name have bene the title of sundry Popes, that were great Idolles vniversally adored) yet do I hold that Magistrates should abolish Idol-names being of no vse. 3, you have no such cause to commend the zeale of this *Sylvester*, who though he be sayd to have changed some particular names of the dayes, yet is he therewithall noted to have turned them vnto an other Idolatrous name of *ferie*, which the heathens vsed to expresse their Idolatrous worship and feasts: *feriæ, a feriendo victimas*: I could wish Christian Magistrates to go further then he, though in the meane time, I see no warrant for you and your people to change the names of dayes and Moneths in your speech and writings as you vse to doe: in such maner that many do not vnderstand you.

a Ioh. Bale Pageant of Popes, lib. 1 in Silvest. 1

3. As for the promise of God *Hos.2.17. to take away the names of Baalim, &c.* It was then performed for the substance of it: when Idol-worship was remooved from them; even as on the contrary, the name of God, is sayd c *to be forgotten*, when false worship is set vp. God might be true in accomplishing that promise, though the names of persons were not changed in such maner as in *Numb 32.38.* Therfore those two places should not be so strictly matched togather. Thus also is that d propheſie concerning Christe to be vnderstood: viz. that he would not take the names of the Idols into his mouth in any act of honour vnto them, or in any vnnecessary vse. And thus also is that exhortation of the Apostle *Eph.5.3.* to be vnderstood of vs.

c Psal.44. 20.

d Ps.16.4.

In the second place you come to shew the meaning of that

law *Deut.* 12.3. & therein, 1. you do needlesly and superfluously alledge divers scriptures, to prove that *all naming of false Gods is not absolutely forbidden*; for that is no part of our question, neither have I in any place denyed the same. 2. Your interpretation is insufficient when you do so generally and confusedly tell vs that *such naming or reteyning of their names, as tendeth any way to the vpholding of their superstition*, is forbidden; but do not tell vs by what reteyning of their names men do vphold their superstition: whereas in a just exposition you should distinctly and particularly have determined, whether the beating of their names, as Phebe, Mercurie, Fortune, or the like be a meanes to vphold their superstition; or if not that, what other reteyning of their names.

After these generall replyes, you come to speak of some of the Idolatrous names reteyned in the new Testament: & therein, 1. You do idely and impertinently ask me, *How I prove that those names, were at first given them in any respect of honour to the Idols of the heathens?* For what though the names of vile Idols were not given to that intent vnto any person by his parents, at the first, could not thē the reteyning of such names in the time of the law be a transgression of that commandement *Deut.* 12.3 or doth this respect of the name-giver alter the law? herein you seeme to stumble at the stone which the Papists do so often fall vpon, namely in seeking to justify their actions by their good respects and intents.

2. To your question of *Hermes in Rom.* 16.14. I answer, suppose he had his name either of *Hermes Trismegistus*, or of the notation of the name, an *Interpretor*: yet doth it not therfore ceasse to be the name of an Idol: The name of *Baal*, though given to divers men: and though for the notation thereof it signify *a Lord* or an *husband*, and was e sometimes given vnto God, yet being also the name of an Idol, the Lord doth therfore forbid the reteyning thereof, commanding his people to f call him *Ishi*, and to call him no more *Baali*.

e Esa. 54.5
f Hos. 2.16

3. To your question concerning *Phœbe, Rom.* 16.1. I answer, 1. You

1. You do in vaine distinguish between the heathen goddesse and the moone: seing the moone was that their goddesse worshipped by them. 2, vvhether those that gave this name vnto Phœbe had reference to the Idol, or to the signification of the name, that skilles not much to the justifying of the action. Actions are to be judged of by the word of God, and not by the respects of men. If you should give vnto your Children the names of *Mercurie, Iupiter, Venus, Diana*: and excuse it thus, that you had no reference vnto the heathnish Idolles but onely to the signification of the names: could your conscience rest in this?

4 You say, *We finde that* g *Bell or Beell was the name of an Idol, and in Beelzebub it is the name of a false God, 2. Kin. 1. 2. But when David named his sonne* h *Beel-jada, will you say he had reference to any Idol: or rather simply to the common use and signification of that word?* I answer, 1. you presume without warrant in saying that David named his Sonne *Beel-iada*, we see that sonne hath an other name, to wit, *Eliada*, 2. *Sam.* 5. 16. and *1. Chron.* 3.8. how know you that *Beel-jada*, was the name that David chose? 2. The name of *Bel* and *Beel* are not properly Hebrew names to signify the Idol, but rather Babylonish or Syrian words; neither is it Beelzebub, as you write, but *Baal-zebub* in 2. *Kin.* 1.2. why should you think that David spoke in a strange dialect? 3. Suppose the name Beel-jada, had bene given to that sonne at the first, yet seing he hath an other name also, why might we not thē think, that this was given as a correction of the first, as the name of *Ierubbaal* was afterwards called i *Ierubbeshcth*? 4. If Davids reference to the common signification of the word might excuse him in giving the name of *Baal* vnto his children, as you plead, then by the like reason he might have given vnto other of his sonnes, the names of *Dagon, Ashtaroth, Molech, Nebo, Chemosh* & of other abhominable Idols and have maintayned his fact by his respect vnto the notation of these names. And if this respect and reference might thus warrant the giving of a name, why might it not warrant the reteyning of an Idols name, by changing

g Esa. 46. 1.
h 1. Chron. 14.7.
i 2 Sam. 12. 24.

ging the reſpect? And then what needed the Children of Ruben
i Numb. 32. 38. to have changed the names i of *Nebo and Baalmeon*, while they might have ſayd, we have no longer reference to the Idols, but to the common vſe and ſignification of theſe words?

5. Having ſpoken of Popiſh ſuperſtition performed to Peter, Paul and Iames, you then aſk: *When men give their Children civill names of Peter, Iames, &c, muſt they needs herein communicate with the Papiſts Idolatrie?* I anſwer, 1. your note of diſtinction and ſpeech of *civil names* is vaine: for the names of theſe apoſtles and holy men may as well be called religious names, yea and ought to be vſed for religious ends, ſerving to admoniſh vs both of the faith, obedience and holy examples of
k Col. 4. 6. ſuch men that we might imitate the ſame, as alſo of the dueties noted in the ſignification of the names: And ſeing all our ſpeech and words which we name ought to have Religious vſe and to ſerve for ædification: how much more that ſpeciall name whereby we are called? 2. The names of *Peter, Iames, Iohn* and ſuch like, as they are religious names, ſo are they alſo allowed of God and commended vnto vs in the ſcriptures for inſtruction and holy vſe: and therfore though they be abuſed by ſome, yet may they more lawfully be given vnto Children, then other Idolatrous names which never receyved any ſuch allowance from God. 3, as for other names of men turned into Idols, whereof you alſo ſpeak, if they by the law of Moſes without any ſin, and without exception be given vnto children: then might the moſt abhominable Idols of the heathen be given and reteyned: ſeing the moſt of their falſe Gods and Idols, as *Saturne, Iupiter, Neptune, Hercules, Iſis* & *Oſyris* and the like are generally by the cheefeſt hiſtorians noted to have bene men and women, deifyed, canonized and turned into Gods by the people that worſhipped them and erected temples vnto them. According to ſuch expoſitions, the law of God might quickly have bene made of no effect.

6. VVhereas you ſay: *it is yet for me to prove, that Paul in mentioning Phæbe, Hermes and others by their common knowne names did*

did contrary to that commandement in Deut. 12. 3. if it ſtand in force at this day. I anſwer, 1. you pervert the queſtion, as though I had affirmed Paul to have done contrary to the commandement, whereas I ſpake of *the reteyning and not aboliſhing* thoſe Idol-names in the Saincts which Paul mentioneth: Is there no difference with you betwixt the men reteyning, or bearing an Idol name, for their title: and the mentioning of the ſame by others? Then *Nebu-chadnezzar*, & *Belſhazzar* did as lawfully in bearing the names of the Idolles *Nebo* & *Bel*: as the Prophet mentioning their titles. 2, if the law in *Deut. 12. 3.* ſtanding in force did not forbid men the reteyning of the names *Mercurie, Venus, Iupiter, Phebe*, and the like wherein I inſtanced, then did it forbid the vſe of no Idol-names, becauſe none were more vile then theſe: nor ſcarce any maner of reteyning them for the outward action, more vile then vpō the perſons of the Saincts, the temples of the holy Ghoſt.

7. Againe you obiect that *the Antichriſtian names of Pope, Abbot, Monke, frier, &c. though vnlawfull to be given vnto men in reſpect of their office, yet miniſters might reteyne them as civill names, though they lived vnder Moſes law, &c.* Anſ. 1, all that you here ſay, is a bare aſſertion and without proofe, not to be admitted. 2, This diſtinction of civil names (if it be ought worth) reproves your practiſe, that do not reteyne the common and civil vſe of the names, given to the dayes of the week, but chāge the ſame. And why do you commend the needleſſe zeale of Pope *Sylveſter* in changing thoſe names, when as the civill vſe of them without reſpect vnto religion, might have ſufficed? 3. If turning Idolatrous names vnto civill vſe, was a ſufficient warrant not to aboliſh them even vnder the law, then what needed that loſſelin burning & breaking downe tēples & groves? might not they have bene turned vnto other proffitable civil vſes? Seing the names & the places were in like maner forbiddē, you may not vſe more indulgence in ſparing one above the other. 4. If the law in *Deut. 12.* do not condemne the civil vſe of names & places abuſed vnto Idolatry, thē do you vniuſtly condēne our

1 Deut. 12. 2. 3. 2. Chron. 14. 3. & 17. 6 & 31. 1. & 34. 3, &c.

vſe of tẽples, which is for a civil help vnto vs as wel as the ſeates & ſtooles that men ſit vpon in the Church, and as well as the ſtaves that old men leane vpon in comming to the worſhip of God. VVe eſteeme all places a like in reſpect of holynes, vſing theſe onely for civil conveniencie and commoditie. 5. The ſpeciall warrant for the Saincts reteyning thoſe old Idolatrous names in the new Teſtament, is that great benefit purchaſed by the death of Chriſte, who thereby n purifyed for our vſe, thoſe things which vnder the law were vncleane and vnlawfull for our vſe; of which benefit more is to be ſpoken hereafter, when I come to anſwer your obiection touching the ſame: where yet vve are alwayes to remember this caution that the creatures & things abuſed vnto Idolatry, are to be forborne, ſave when there is a neceſſary vſe of them: as in the names of *Hermes*, *Phebe* *Fortunatus* and the like, which being formerly given vnto private men, could not be changed by them without manifold ſcandalles and diſcommodities, and therfore in that caſe of neceſſary vſe were lawfully reteyned by them. But as for your plea, of reteyning Antichriſtian names, of Pope, Abbot, monke, &c. for civill vſe: it is not to be admitted vnder the law any more thẽ the giving or reteyning the names of *Baal-zebub*, *Baal-peor*, *Bel*, *Nebo* & the like: no nor yet vnder the Goſpel, whẽ the caſe of neceſſity doth not excuſe them: what Chriſtiã man can without ſcãdall give ſuch names as civill, without neceſſity vnto his childrẽ? Therfore howſoever you do vniuſtly ſeparate frõ the churches of God vpõ pretence of their Idolatry; you do now by this plea proceed to a further countenãcing of idolatry; then that any godly Chriſtian may follow your ſteppes herein.

a Act. 10. 15.
1 Cor. 10. 25. 26.
Tit. 1. 15.
Rõ. 14. 20

Laſtly, whereas you do againe alledge divers places out of *Daniel* to prove that *the law in Deut. 12. 3. forbiddeth not to mẽtion heathen Gods*: you do but trifle, and turne from the queſtion about *reteyning* or bearing the names of Idolles, vnto a queſtion about *mentioning* their names, which I never impugned. Could you have brought any ſound matter againſt the queſtion it ſelf, you would not ſo often have ſlipped from it, even

even three times in this one ſection. As for the Idolatrous names givẽ vnto Daniel and his three frẽds, though he might lawfully in his ſtory mention them: yet the law of Charitie bindes vs to judge, that they bore and reteyned theſe names by conſtraint, being impoſed vpon them againſt their willes, and that they proteſted againſt them: otherwiſe, how could they have bene innocent?

Section. 3.

Hen. Ainſ.

YOur 3. exception is, that the commandement in Deut. 12. is not vniverſal for the place, but expreſſely determined and reſtrayned to the land of Canaan, to the idols of thoſe nations which Iſrael ſhould poſſeſſe; from that place they were to be cut of Deut. 12. 1. 2. 3 even as God would have greater ſeveritie againſt the Canaanites, then other idolaters, Deut. 20. 10. - 15. 16, 17. Ioſ. 9. 6. 7, &c.

I anſwer, this your reſtraint to the idols of Canaan onely, as if God would not have other idols deſtroyed alſo, is not according to the intent of the law: for he mentioneth that place, becauſe they were to poſſeſs it: not intending that if they had poſſeſsiõ of an other place, they ſhould have let the idols remayne. According to which equitie, Magiſtrates now ſhould deſtroy idols in their own dominions, and not thruſt themſelves into other peoples poſſeſſions to doe the like. And that this is the meaning, I manifeſt, firſt by an other like law in Lev. 18. 3. where they were forbidden to doe after the manner of Egypt wherein they dwelt, and of Canaan whither they ſhould come: theſe lands are mentioned by occaſion of Iſraels dwelling in them: not that God permitted them to folow the cuſtomes of other heathens, but vnder theſe two, implied all. Secondly, I ſhew it by other like words in that very law, Deut. 12. as when he ſayth in v. 2. all the places wherin the Nations *which ye ſhall poſſeſs ſerved their Gods: here the limitation is as wel in reſpect of the* Nations *as of the* Land. *But that God reſpected not the places of thoſe heathens onely, appeareth by the execution of this law: when not onely the places wherin the Canaanites worſhiped falſe Gods, but alſo the places wherein the Iſraelites falſly worſhiped the true God, were deſtroyed: le-*

as Ieroboams temples & Altars, & other like, 2 Kin. 23, 15. 19. Thirdly because not the idols of Canaan onely, but of all other nations, are Divils, Deut. 32. 17. 1 Cor. 10. 20. and therfore alike abhorred of God, and to be destroyed as abominable to men. Fourthly, because long after the destruction of the idols of Canaan, God teacheth his people the like detestation and destruction of all Idols in general, Esa. 30. 22. Ier. 10. 11. and 51. 17. 18. Zach. 13. 2. Ezek. 30. 13. Fiftly, the Prophet speaking of the Egyptians, sayth not onely that God would break their images, but that he would also burne the houses of their gods *with fyre, Ier. 43, 13. Wherfore the law extēdeth not to the* Idolies *of Canaan onely, as you suppose. As for Gods greater severitie against the Canaanites and other peoples: there was cause of difference, in respect of the persons: these being come to the* a *fulnes of their iniquitie above other nations; and being Children of the* b *curse, more then other. But betweene idols and idols, Divils and Divils, there is no such difference, that God should root out some, & favour other some: no not the idols of his owvn people, as before is* c *shewved; and so not the idols of Antichrist, which are* c *devils also. And the example of Egypt confirmeth this: for God sayd.* d *Thou shalt not abhorre an Egyptian; yet the idols and Temples of Egypt he would have burnt with fyre, Ier. 43. 13.*

a Gen. 15. 16.

b Gen. 9. 25

c Rev. 9. 20

d Deut. 23. 7.

Answer.

Io. Pa. IN setting downe my third answer: you do in the first place very deceitfully and vniustly repeat the same: for whereas I according to the question betwixt vs, noted that the cōmandement *for destroying idolatrous places* vvas expressely determined and restreyned to the Land of Canaan, to the Idolles of those nations, &c. in stead of this, (the commandement in Deut. 12. being both against Idolatrous places, and the Idols themselves) first you omit and leave out that mention of *Idolatrous places* whereupon I insisted in particular, you speak generally of the *Commandement in Deut. 12.* and afterwards turne it in some of your answers vnto the *Idolles* themselves, *as if God would not have*

have other Idolles destroyed, contrary vnto my words and meaning: as the reader may see in my n former writing. There is a great difference betwixt these two sentences: *The commandemēt in Deut. 12. is restreyned to the destruction off the Idolles of those nations*, which I sayd not: and this, *The commandement for destroying Idolatrous places is restreyned to the Idolles of those nations, &c.* which was my answer.

n Pag. 20.

In the next place you bring 5. reasons to prove that there was no such restreynt, &c. And first, you labour to manifest it, *by an other like law in Levit. 18. 3. where they were forbidden to do after the maner of Egypt wherein they dwelt, & of Canaan whither they should come, &c.* I answer.

1. Though God have forbidden men to imitate the maner & workes of the Egyptians & other natiōs in their Idolatrous services and other abhominable practises, as well as the Idolatries of Canaan: yet doth it not follow hence, that he hath condemned the vse of the places in all alike. The law *in Lev. 18. 3.* is not in this particular poynt of *the place* like vnto that in *Deut. 12.* This you should have manifested, if you could.

2. If vsing the place of false worshippers be *a doing after their maner*, then are you guilty of following the maner of the Iewes seing since your separation from Mr. Iohnson, you have sometimes had your ordinary publique meetings for the worship of God, in the same place where they have also ordinarily and publiquely exercised their abhominable Idolatries and false worship.

Your second reason is taken from *other like words in that very law, Deut. 12. 2. all the places wherein the Nations which ye shall possess, &c. and the execution of this law in destroying the places of Idolatrous Israelites, as Ieroboams temples, &c.* Answ. Seing even by your owne confession and words, *the limitation is as wel in respect of the* Nations *as of the* Land; all reason requires, when any commandement is described in divers words, whereof some are more full and ample then others, that then the limitation should be vnderstood according to those phrases that are of

greateſt extent: and conſequently the commandement for the *Land* of Canaan, conteyning not onely the particular places vvhere the Canaanitiſh nations, but alſo the places where the Idolatrous Iſraelites did worſhip their Idols, might ſerve for a warrant vnto *Ioſias* to deſtroy Ieroboams temples being within the Land of Canaan, 2. *Kin.* 23. But what is this to vs that are without the, *Land of Canaan*? The fulleſt and ampleſt phraſe in that commandement Deut. 12. doth not extend vnto the places which we reteyne in the worſhip of God.

Your third reaſon is, *becauſe not the idols of Canaan onely, but of all other nations are Divilles, Deut.* 32.17. 1 *Cor.* 10. 20. *and therfore alike abhorred of God and to be deſtroyed as abhominable to men.* I anſwer,

1. Though Idolles be called Devilles, yet doth it not follow from thence, that the places where they have bene formerly ſerved, may not be converted vnto the vſe of Chriſtians to worſhip God in the ſame: you bring ſcriptures to prove the antecedent of this reaſon, which you needed not: but for proſe of the conſequent you bring nothing, which you ſhould have done: if you would have made your reaſon good.

o Mat. 17. 21. & 12. 45. 2. VVe know that Devilles are of o ſundry kindes and ſome wicked Spirits are worſe then others: as alſo are the Idolles and the different ſervices of them; and therfore we cannot ſay that they are *alike abhorred* of God; or that the places where they have bene ſerved are in like manner to be deſtroyed of men.

3. Suppoſe that all Devilles, Idolles and the ſervices of them were in themſelves & in their owne nature equally evill; yet as the circumſtance of the place doth often aggravate the ſin, ſo God having taken and appropriated the Land of Canaan vnto himſelf to be p *his Land* in a peculiar manner, how can you ſay but that the pollution of this holy Land by Idolatrie, might in this regard deſerve a greater deteſtation of all the monuments, inſtruments and meanes of ſuch pollution?

p Levit. 25. 23. 24.

q Mark. 16 9. Luk. 8. 2. 4. VVe ſee in q *Mary Magdalene*, that the very ſame breaſt which was firſt a real poſſeſſion of wicked Spirits, a cage of vncleane

cleane birds, and an habitation of Devilles, was afterwards ſanctifyed to be an holy temple and habitation of God by his ſpirit: If the glorious and bleſſed God refuſe not to be worſhipped and dwell in ſuch a Den of Devilles after it is once purged, why ſhould we in this reſpect of former pollution (having no other ſpeciall reſtraint) refuſe to worſhip God in ſuch an habitation of idolles, when as the Idolatrie is remooved, and the place purifyed from the former vncleannes of the Devill?

5. If the worſhip of Devilles make places ſo polluted that no cleanſing will make them fit for the publique ſervice of God, then is that place of your aſſembly vnlawfull, where you have taught the doctrine of Devilles; ſeing r their doctrines are part of their worſhip, even as the doctrines of God are a part of Gods worſhip and ſervice. In ſ your writings againſt the Church of England, to prove that they are *departers from the faith, no true Chriſtians, holding fundamentall errours, teaching the doctrines of Devilles*: you aliedge that *that Church forbiddeth mariage, &c.* namely, *vnto fellowes of colledges, prentiſes, and to all men and women in Lent, Advent, Rogation Week, &c.* If this corruption dravv ſuch a heavy Burden vpon the back of England, then vvill it bring as heavy a Doome vpon your ovvne heads, vvho teach the Doctrine of devilles by forbidding Mariage in a far vvorſe maner then the Church of England doth, viz. by forbidding your people, all both men and vvomen, to mary vvith the godly members of the Reformed Churches, & this not for any terme of yeares, at any ſet time, but at all times: yea excommunicating ſuch of your people as have ſo maryed with the members of the Dutch Church, ſetting downe this mariage as one cauſe of your giving them to Satan: And in the cordes of this ſin you are ſtill holden, wanting repentance for your evill: for this doctrine of Devilles, which is a part of their worſhip, according to your owne reaſoning, the very place where you have ſo worſhipped is to be deſtroyed, and can never be cleanſed vnto a lawfull vſe in the worſhip of God.

r Mat. 15. 9

ſ Anſ. to Mr. Iacob. p. 135, 140 147.

Your fourth reaſon is, *becauſe long after the deſtruction of the Ido-*

Idoles of Canaan, God teacheth his people the like deteſtation and deſtruction of all Idols in generall, Eſa. 30. 22. Ier. 10. 11. & 51. 17. 18. Zach. 13. 2. Ezek. 30. 13. Anſwer. You do here run quite beſide the queſtion: from the Idolatrous places to the Idolles themſelves. And of all the ſcriptures that you here produce, there is not one of them that ſpeakes a word, touching the deſtruction of ſuch places, as have bene abuſed to Idolatry but either of the Idols themſelves or of other vnneceſſary appurtenances belonging vnto them. VVhen you ſhew by any juſt conſequence of argument, how they ſpeak for you: you ſhall then (godwilling) receyve further anſwer.

Your fift reaſon is, that *the Prophet ſpeaking of Egyptians, ſayth not onely that God would breuk their images, but that he alſo would burne the* houſes of their Gods *with fyre, Ier. 43. 13. Wherfore the law extendeth not to the Idolies of Canaan onely, &c.* I anſwer.

1. Here indeed is ſpeech, not onely of the images, but alſo of their houſes deſtroyed: and this you note ſo plainely and diſtinctly, that I wonder how you could not obſerve it, in your former reaſon, vnleſſe you did willingly winke and purpoſely turne away frō the queſtiō. 2, there is yet in this ſpeech no preſcription or rule to binde vs to deale in like maner with all other places abuſed to Idolatry: The deſtruction here noted is a judgement of God executed by t Nebuchadnezzar an Idolater himſelf, that had no conſcience or regard of that commandement, Deut. 12. vvho did alſo by the like judgement of God burne the u *temple* at Ieruſalem, and not onely the houſe of the Lord, but alſo the *Kings howſe, and all the howſes* of Ieruſalem: So that by ſuch reaſonings as this, from the judgements of God by heathens, you might as well conclude the deſtroying and aboliſhing of private mens houſes for their Idolatry: of palaces and judgement halles: and of Gods owne howſe ſo oft as it was defiled by Idoles.

t Ier. 43. 10

u Ier. 52. 13

That which I ſayd for illuſtration of this poynt, in reſpect of greater ſeverity ſhewed vnto the Idolatours of Canaan themſelves, in their owne perſons, as vvel as in their Idoll-places, is ſo

ſo plaine, that in ſtead of refuting the ſame, you go about to confirme the ſame by bringing reaſons thereof from the *fullnes of their ſin*: and becauſe they were the *Children of the curſe more then other*. And yet there is a further and higher cauſe thereof, even the hid counſell of God, and the good pleaſure of his will: for others alſo as the Iewes came to w fullnes of ſin, and became the x Children of curſe, more then other for their contempt of the Goſpell: yea more then the Canaanites themſelves; for the y Sidonians were Canaanites: yet was there no warrant for any therevpon to ſhew ſo great ſeverity againſt their perſons. That which you repeat touching the difference betwixt idols and idols, devils and devils: as alſo touching the deſtruction of the temples of Egypt is already anſwered.

v Mat. 23. 32--36. with 1. Theſſ. 2. 15. 16.

x Mat. 11. 21. 22.

y Gen. 10. 15.

Section 4.

YOur 4. *exception is, ſome meats ſacrificed to Idols were as much polluted as the places of their worſhip, and yet may now be reteined for our neceſſarie vſe, Pſal. 24. 1. with 1. Cor. 10. 25.--27. Why not the temples alſo, contrary to the ceremonie of old?* Hen. Ainſ. ,, ,, ,,

I anſwer: The reaſon is becauſe the abſteyning from meats offred to idols, was a ſhadow among other ſhadowes, a Touch not, taſt not handle not: *but the commandement to deſtroy idolies, was not a ceremonie or ſhadow to be abrogated by Chriſt, as before is ſhewed: but a moral precept and perpetual: and we are now plainly permitted to eat ſuch ſacrificed meat, 1 Cor. 10. and as plainly commanded ſtill to keep our ſelves from idols, 1. Ioh. 5, 21. And ſuch are Antichriſts temples, being conſecrated by many popiſh inchantments, vnto the* b *honour of creatures; to be kept through the interceding merits of all ſaints and by infuſion of grace, to be purified from all pollution: and to be no other then the howſe of God, and the gate of heaven, &c. Now how theſe abominable places, ſhould be by the blood of Chriſt, or by the word & prayer ſanctified to be places for Gods people to worſhip him in; appeareth not by Pſal. 24. compared with 1 Cor. 10. but rather the contrary. For thoſe meats offred to idols, which might be eaten ſold in*

a Col. 2. 16. 17. 20. 21. Heb. 9. 10.

b Pontifical. de benedict. primi lap. pro eccleſia ædific.

the ſhambles, or at an infidels private table, might not be eaten in the idols temple: although ſuch as did eat them there, knew that the idol was nothing, and thought it therfore in their Chriſtian libertie to ſit at table there, 1.Cor. 8.4.10. and 10.19.-22. Neyther am I of your minde, that the meats offred to idols, are as much polluted as the idol or idol temple: for (if we may by the Apoſtles c *example, compare things with Iſrael after the fleſh,) as the temple of God, was greater then the gold thereof, and the Altar greater then the gift offred thereon, being ſanctified (as our ſaviour* d *witneſſeth,) by the temple and Altar: then by like reaſon, theſe idol-temples and altars in them, were worſe then all the offrings, and did pollute the ſacrifices, and not the ſacrifices them. Moreover, in Deut. 12. which is the ſcripture in hand, you finde no ſuch commandement to deſtroy meats or other things offred to idols, as there is for the idols and idolies themſelves: ſo where the law is ſilent, you ſhould not ſpeak. Finally, though it was lawfull to eat Gods good creatures which the gentiles had ſacrificed to idols; yet was it not lawfull (by 1.Cor. 10.) to uſe things for that whereunto idolaters had in ſpeciall manner conſecrated them: but you uſe theſe Idoleies, for that whervnto idolaters* e *conſecrated them: viz. for prayer, and for the Word & Sacraments.*

c 1.Cor. 10 18.

d Mat. 23. 16.-19.

e Bellarmin. de cultu ſanct. l. 3. c. 4.

Anſwer.

Io. Pa. IN your reply vnto my fourth anſwer, taken from the lawfull vſe of things ſacrificed to Idolles, though as much polluted as the places where the Idols were ſerved,

Firſt, you do vniuſtly make one of theſe to be a ſhadow and ceremony rather then the other: And the places alledged by your ſelf do ſerve for your refutation. For doth not the Apoſtle *Col. 2.21.* deſcribe the ceremonies there ſpoken of, as well by thoſe wordes of *Touch not, handle not*; as by the words of *Taſt not*? And do not men in abſteyning from vncleane places, obſerve the ceremony of *Touch not*; as well as they do the ceremony of *Taſt not*, by abſteyning from vncleane meat? when God ordeyned and determined a ceremoniall vncleannes, vpon

vpon the z entring into the houſe of the dead, that men ſhould be vncleane by touching the ground of that place with their feet, as well as by handling the dead body with their hands: this ſhewes that the ceremony of *Touch not* is to be obſerved & acknowledged in abſteyning from places, as well as in abſteyning from meates. This appeareth further by the a commandement of keeping vncleane perſons and that in divers degrees from entring or coming into holy places, and from Touching of them, vvhat aileth you then, that you cannot ſee a ceremony in abſteyning frō the vncleane place of the dead idols, as wel as in abſteyning from the vncleane meate of the dead Idols? And as for *Heb. 9.10.* doth not the Apoſtle as well mention *carnall rites* in generall, as abſtinence from meates and drinks in particular? And why is not the ceremony of not touching an vncleane place, as well a carnall rite, as the not touching of an vncleane meate? Againſt this you bring nothing: That which you ſay, you ſhewed before, concerning the deſtroying of Idolies, is before anſwered alſo.

z Numb. 19. 14.

a Levit. 13. 46. & 12. 4 Numb. 5. 2. 3. Exod. 3. 5. & 19. 12.

Secondly, whereas you alledge that *We are ſtill commanded to keep our ſelves from Idols 1.Ioh. 5.21.* & would ſhew withall, that our temples are Idols, *being conſecrated by many popiſh inchantments, vnto the honour of creatures, &c.* I anſwer, 1. This kinde of vnlawfull conſecration though it be a greevous ſin, yet doth it not make our temples to be Idols: you do onely give vs your bare word, but bring no ſhew of ſcripture for proofe of this poynt. 2, vvhen you do bring any ſcripture to this end, you ſhall finde, that the ſame ſcriptures will as well prove meates ſacrificed to Idoles, to be very Idols, as the places cōſecrate vnto them: and that they will as much condemne the Idololythes, as the Idolies; ſeing that the Idolothytes, or ſacrificed meates are alſo conſecrate by many heathniſh and deviliſh rites vnto the honour of creatures, as well as the Idolies or temples. 3. If our temples be *very Idols*, as afterwards againe you ſpeak, then with what conſcience or warrant can you or any of yours frequent the ſame for the worſhip of God, as your maner is by

coming vnto the library of the great church in this citie where I have divers times found you? vnder the worſhip or ſervice of God, according to your owne deſcription, is comprehended, b *all manner work, labour, induſtry of body or minde to help forward* any Religious action; ſo that your ſtudy in the library muſt be acknowledged a worſhip of God, a *gnabodah* comprehending both *dulia* & *latreia*, as you note in the ſame place. Now as it is ſayd of *Moloch* that there vvere many chambers in that huge Idol: ſo vve ſee that Nebuchadnezzars Idol erected in the plaine of Dura, being c *threeſcore cubites high and ſix cubites broad* in greatnes like vnto a ſtately and high tovver or ſteeple which might conteyne in it many celles, chambers & roomes (though not ſo great as this Idol which you haunt:) and now according to your preſent practiſe and profeſsion, if there had bene a library in one of thoſe roomes, & if you had lived in thoſe times you would have made no ſcruple to have gone vp into the chambers of that monſtrous Idol, even for the worſhip of God to have ſitten in the celles and ſtudyed in the library thereof. Though *Ananias*, *Azarias and Miſhael* did chooſe rather to goe into d *a hote oven*, then to do any honour vnto that beaſt; yet you without feare or ſuſpicion of doing any honour vnto that fiēd, would willingly in the ſight of all have gone in at the dore or mouth of that Image, couched in ſome hollow tooth, or ſit in ſome great gutte of that Devill (for all Idols are Devilles as you confeſſe) and there have ſtudyed as in the oracle of Apollo. Yea and all this while, you would boldly have maintained your ſeparation from all the churches of Chriſte, as being the one onely miniſter in the earth, free from a polluted communion: while all other are condemned by you as defiled with the filthines of Antichriſtian Idols. O *Mr. Ainſworth*, ponder with your ſelf what godly wiſedome, modeſty or ſincerity can be in this your ſtrange and contradictory practiſe and profeſsion. If our temples be *Devilles* and *Idolles*, *devote vnto deſtruction*, and this of God, as you write, how may any Servant of God imitate your example, in ſitting ſo ſecurely in that

b Arrow againſt Idolatry. Chap. 1. ſec. 11.

c Dan. 3. 1.

d Ibid. verſ. 6. 12. &c. 23.

that place over which the judgement of God and the ſword of his vengeance doth hang continually, none knowing when it ſhall fall? As the Lord of old paſsing through Egipt did ſodainely e deſtroy their Idolles, ſo ſtill he f threatens them: & their deſtruction is juſt that vvill tempt God and ſit in the boſome of knowne Idolles: If a ſodaine tumult by men, or a thunder bolt from heaven ſhould come to daſh out the braines of abhominable Idolles, how could you thinke to eſcape ſitting as it were in the middes of the braines, ſtudying in the bookes of this library in the Idol-temple as you take it? Yea, if it were but for any civil buſines, to do the work of any trade whatſoever, what conſcionable man knowing the judgement of God againſt Idolles, that durſt make his ſhop in the belly of ſuch an execrable, anathematized or damned Image? Though you have written a booke, and called it, an *Arrow againſt Idolatry*, yet do you not feare, as is meete, the Arrowes of God, which he hath made ready vpon the ſtrings of his Bow againſt the face of every Idol.

e Exo. 12. 12.

f Eſa. 19. 1. & 46. 1.

Thirdly, where you ſay *it doth not appeare by pſ. 24. compared with 1. Cor. 10. how theſe abhominable places ſhould be by the blood of Chriſte, and by the word and prayer ſanctifyed, &c.* I anſwer, 1. David in pſ. 24. propheſying of Chriſte, *the king of Glory*; of the eternall durance of his Church, ſignifyed by *the everlaſting dores*: of his entrance into and of his adminiſtration of that ſpirituall Kingdome, ſignifyed by *the opening of the dores* before him, and this according to your owne g expoſition alſo; doth in the beginning of the pſalme ſhew the largenes of his dominiō, over all creatures and places in Sea and land, he being made h heire of all things: If therfore Chriſte be a King vniverſall & a Monarch then may he be worſhipped in every place, els that place ſhould be none of his rightfull dominion: If we alſo be i heires with Chriſte of the earth, then may ech place of our inheritance ſerve vs for a place to worſhip the Lord in. This donation of the earth for our vſe being indefinite, is to be vnderſtood in the largeſt ſenſe for our comfort, while no reſtraint is

g Annot. on pſ. 24. 7.

h Heb. 1. 2.

i Rom. 8. 17.

added. They that vnwarrantably reſtreyne this gift vnto a civil vſe onely, they rob both Chriſte and his Servants of a great part of their inheritance. 2, vvhereas you inſiſt, that theſe meates ſacrificed to jdols *might not be eaten in the Idols-temple*: the Apoſtle ſpeaks according to the preſent eſtate of thoſe temples, while jdolatry vvas ſtill exerciſed in them; vvhile thoſe Idol-feaſts were kept, vvhich vvere a part of their [k] falſe vvorſhip performed vnto the Idols: but vvhat is this to the Religious vſe of theſe places purged from Idolatry and imployed in the true vvorſhip of God?

k 1. Cor. 10.7.21

Fourthly, vnto your comparative reaſon to prove Idol-temples vvorſe then Idol-ſacrifices, becauſe they pollute the ſacrifices and not the ſacrifices them; as on the contraty the temple ſanctifyed the gold, &c. I anſvver. 1, your compariſon is vnequall and vnlike; for the ſanctification of the oblations and ſacrifices depended vpon one temple and Altar therein: there being no other place to ſanctify their offrings: but the conſecration of theſe meates ſacrificed to Idols did not depend vpon any one temple or Altar: their altars vvere many as heapes in the furrovves of the field: therfore a different povver for conſecration is to be obſerved. Neither is it true vvhich you ſay that the Idol-ſacrifices did not pollute the places: though the holy ſacrifices could not ſo much ſanctify the altar of the Lord as the altar them Mat. 23. yet might the Idols ſacrifice as much pollute, the Idol-places, as the places them: becauſe in vncleane things there is often a [m] ſtronger working to pollute, then there is in holy things to ſanctify. Yet further, that men be not deceyved in the miſvnderſtanding of Chriſts words, *Mat. 23. 17, 19.* it is alſo to be conſidered how God would that [n] both altar and temple ſhould be ſanctifyed by the offrings. 2, ſuppoſe it were as you ſay, that Idol-places were worſe thē the Idol-ſacrifices: thē mark into what evilles you caſt your ſelf: Then the places where we worſhip are worſe then the Idol-ſacrifice of the Maſſe, worſe then the ſacrificing of a childe vnto Moloch: and communion in the true worſhip in one of theſe

1 Hoſ. 12. 11.

m Hag. 2. 13, 14.

n Levit. 16 20. Numb. 7. 10. 88. 1 Kin. 8. 63. 2 Chron. 29. 21. 24.

theſe temples is worſe then communion with the Maſſe or any of thoſe abhominable ſacrifices offred out of the Idol-temples appoynted therevnto: Then how is your apoſtaſy aggravated hereby, when after your ſeparation, you yeelded to worſhip God in one of theſe polluted places, committinga more vncleane ſin then if you had yeelded to heare the Maſſe, or to communicate in any heatheniſh Idolothyte out of the Idol-temple? Then how great is your ſin ſtill, which tolerate among you an Idolater, that dayly worſhippeth God in one of theſe temples? by this kinde of reaſoning, you might as well allow the members of your ſeparate company to heare Maſſe, or to participate with other abhominable Idolatries: Thus do you daſh your feet againſt the ſtones, which yon caſt in our way: & cruſh your ſelf in peeces, with your owne reaſons returning vpon your head.

Fiftly, you ſay, that in *Deut. 12. which is the ſcripture in hand, you finde no ſuch Commandement to deſtroy meates or other things offred to Idols, &c.* I anſwer, 1. If I finde it for you in other places of ſcripture, though not in that, yet have you no cauſe to accuſe me, for ſpeaking, where the law is ſilent. 2, even the analogie of that place Deut. 12. ſhewes their deſtruction: for if there can be no further vncleannes and pollution ſhewed in the places there appoynted to be deſtroyed, then there is in the Idol-ſacrifices: then doth the equity of that law require that like things ſhould be alike deſtroyed. 3, vve ſee more expreſſely in other places of ſcripture that things dedicate or givē to Idols were to be deſtroyed: as the [o] *horſes* conſecrate to the Sun which *Ioſias* aboliſhed: and the *Chariots of the Sunne*, which he burnt with fire. 4, even your ſelf in this ſection confeſſe abſtinence from things offred to Idolles to bea ſhadow or ceremonie, &c. If they muſt be abſteyned from and not eaten thē were they deſtroyed; whether burnt with fire, or given to the Dog, or othervviſe deſtroyed, it ſkilleth not. How then do you forget your ſelf? 5, afterwards againe in the next chapter you plainely argue that heathniſh temples were to be deſtro-

o 2 Kin. 23 11.

ſtroyed, becauſe they were *part of their Religion and Idolatries*: which you prove, becauſe *Cicero* calles them *holy and religious*: Now I hope you will not deny but that Idolothytes or Idol-ſacrifices were alſo a part of their religion and Idolatrie, that the heathens accounted theſe ſacrifices *holy and religious*, as well as their temples: and therfore it followes moſt plainely by your owne reaſoning, that they were to be deſtroyed as well as their temples. Thus you ſee there is no cauſe to complayne of me for ſpeaking, where yourſelf are not ſilent.

Finally, you adde, that *it was not lawfull (by 1 Cor. 10.) to vſe things for that wherevnto Idolaters had in ſpeciall manner conſecrated them, &c.* Anſw. 1. It is ſhewed before from pſ. 24. with 1 Cor. 10. that we may have not onely a civill but alſo a religious vſe of ſuch things notwithſtanding any ſuch conſecration. 2, though *Bellarmin* ſay, that their temples were conſecrated for prayer, for the word and Sacraments; yet doth it not follow that we vſe them for the ſame things; becauſe our prayers, preaching of the word & Sacraments are not the ſame with theirs; their prayers being Idolatrous invocations of creatures: their ſcriptures, apocryphal: their preachings, heretical; their Sacrament of Euchariſt, an horrible Idol, &c. For theſe things they vvere conſecrated ſome of them: but for theſe ends we vſe them not.

Section. 5.

Hen. Ainſ. *To your 5. exception, about the burning of the remnants of the ſacrifices, &c. We doe all agree that thoſe things with the ordinances about them, were ſhadowes, and are aboliſhed by Chriſt: and therfore no conſequence can be gathered for the like outward practiſe now, but onely for the ſpiritual equitie.*

Anſwer.

Io. Pa. THough the holy things of God of old, as the remainder of the ſacrifices, were to be aboliſhed vvhen the religious vſe ceaſſed, yet can there no juſt conſequence be gathered for the like

like practiſe now in aboliſhing the remainders of bread and wine in the Lords ſupper: Thus much you graunt; and thus far we agree. But whereas in my anſwer vnto you, I ſhewed further, that God did in like manner command to aboliſh one as well as the other: the high places of Canaan, as the remainders of certaine ſacrifices: to this you ſay nothing. It remaines therfore for you to ſhew, why one of theſe commandements ſhould ſtill be in force rather then the other. If you thinke that one of theſe commandements is a ceremoniall ſhadow rather then the other: though the contrary hath bene already ſhewed before, yet it may further alſo appeare by this, becauſe theſe things, viz. *The aboliſhing of holy things after the religious vſe*: & *the aboliſhing of Idolatrous places after the vncleane vſe*, are commandements of like nature both for the action in themſelves, and proportion vnto things ſignifyed: the one ſhadowing out vnto vs a ſpeciall eſtimation of Gods ordinances, as the other ſhadowed out a ſpeciall deteſtation of mens inventions.

Section. 6.

Hen. Ainſ. *YOur laſt exception is, that God of old appointed one onely place for ſacrifice, Deut. 12. 5. 6. Lev. 17. 3. 4. therfore thoſe high places being for ſacrifice, were to be deſtroyed, &c. but now difference of place is taken away, Ioh. 4. 21,*

I anſwer: Firſt the law ſpeaketh of a all places *wherein the natiõs* ſerved *their Gods: ſo that though they were not for ſacrifice, but for prayer, or other like vſe, they were to be pulled downe. Secondly though there was to be but one place for ſacrificing, yet foloweth it not that that was the cauſe (at leaſt the onely cauſe) why heathenish idols and idoleies ſhould be deſtroyed: but for that they were divils, and divils howſes, and a part of their religion which God abhorreth, and men ſhould deteſt, therfore were they to be demoliſhed, as Moſes ſheweth in Deut. 7. 25. 26. and Exod. 23. 24. And this appeareth by Iakobs practiſe, who* b *aboliſhed idols and moniments of them, before any one place was choſen: and ſo did* c *Moſes deſtroy the idols in the Wilder-*

a Deut. 12. 2.

b Gen. 35. 2. 3 4.

c Exo. 32. 20.

 nes,

nes, before the Tabernacle was made. In other lands also, as d in Egypt,
d Ier. 44.12. 13. & 48. 7.13. & 50 2. Ezek. 30 13. Moab, Babylon, &c. where no one place was chosen for sacrifice: yet God would destroy the Idols and idol temples, for detestation of them. Thirdly, If we look vpon the thing figured by that one place, it will lead vs from these idol-temples now, rather then to them. For principally the Temple of old, figured e Christ: secondarily the f Church of
e Ioh. 2.19. 21. f 2. Cor. 6. 16. Christians. In both respects we should avoyd to worship God vnder the shadow of the idols of Antichrist: for the Apostle sayth, g What
g 2 Cor. 6. 15.16. concord hath Christ with Belial? and (of the Church he sayth) What agreement hath the temple of God, with idols? So the type of one place, helpeth you nothing. No more will the taking away of the difference of place, which you last insist vpon. For our saviours words (in Ioh. 4) ought in reason to be expounded according to his Fathers law, not against it, even by his own doctrine, Mat. 5. 17. So that when idols and idolies are destroyed as God commanded, and the typicall sanctitie of Ierusalem is ended: then are all places free to worship God in, in spirit and trueth. And seing Christ, to bring in the true spiritual worship, would not onely end, but even h destroy the citie &
h Dan. 9. 26. the Sanctuarie, which once were holy: how can we think, that he would have the idolie of the Samaritans stand vndestroyed: or the abominations that his enemie Antichrist should afterwards erect? And the text it self, if it be considered, teacheth not otherweise. For first, it sheweth that God shalbe worshiped, i neyther in the mount of
i Ioh. 4.21. Samaria (where they committed idolatrie) nor in Ierusalem, (where the typicall worship had bene for a time.) Wherupon it followeth, that Antichrist having erected temples for idols, in imitation of Ierusalems temple purposely in the parts and Shape, as the k Papists ac-
k Bellarm. de cultu sanct. l. 3. c. 3. knowledge: and conjured them with moe Pope-holy rites, and for moe irreligious vses, then there were holy rites and vses of Solomons temple, as is to be seen in the Pontifical: we are rather to conclude, that God is not to be worshiped in them. Secondly, Christ there teacheth
l Ioh. 4.23. 24. all men to worship God l in spirit and trueth: which are opposed both to the figurative worship of the Iewes, and false worship of the gentiles but Antichrists temples are a part of the false worship which he hath forged as the gentiles did of old (as shal anone be more fully mani-

manifested:) therfore Christ by those words, rather calleth vs from them then vnto them, by his doctrine in Ioh. 4. Thirdly, We cannot in reason think, that there should be more indifferencie of place now, then there is indifferencie of other things, seing th' Apostle sayth m vnto the pure all things are pure: vvhervpon you may as wel conclude a lawfull vse of popish garments, images, and other things of his religion, as of his idol places. And so the minister may weare a cope, miter, surplice, &c. in his ministration (vvhich the Pope appointed in imitation of the Levitical preistly garments) as vvel as minister in a popish sanctuarie; and all other his abominable rites, may be retained of vs Christians in our Churches, by as good reason as the temples of his abomination. Which is as contrary to Christs intendement in Ioh. 4. as darknes is to light. And thus Deut. 12 2.3. compared with Exod. 20.4.5.6. is of force to throw downe idols and idol temples, notwithstanding all that you have sayd to vphold them. And according to your manner of pleading for idolies, the Corinthians, (vvhom Paul convinced of sin for eating in the idolie, n by an argument of Israels practise) might also have pleaded, that those things concerned Israel vvhich vvere a special people separated from all other, and they were bound to eat of the sacrifices before Gods sanctuarie onely, one peculiar place: but now, the earth is the Lords and the plentie therof, all places are alike, all idols are nothing, & were by them so knowen & estemed. And even as you plead against Deut. 12. vvhich is an explanation of the 2. Commandement: so o some Papists have also pleaded against the 2. commandement it self, that it vvas a temporal precept, and that now vnder the nevv Testament images are lavvfull.

m Tit. 1.15

n 1. Cor. 10. 18.

o Bellarm. de Imagin. l. 2. c. 7.

Answer.

MY last answer to your first reason, was this, that *there is not the like reason to abolish the buildings abused vnto Idolatry now, as the high places of old, because God having then appointed one onely place for sacrifice, Deut. 12. 5. 6, &c. Lev. 17. 3, 4. Those high places being for sacrifice vvere to be destroyed, though no Idolatry had bene committed in them; but being polluted vvith the service of Idols, there*

Io. Pa.

vvas then double cauſe of their deſtruction, vvhich is not nowv in theſe, vvhile difference of place is taken avvay, Ioh. 4. 21.

Your firſt reply vnto this, is: that *the lavv ſpeaketh of* all *places vvherein the nations* ſerved *their Gods: ſo that though they vvere not for ſacrifice, but for prayer, or other like vſe, they vvere to be pulled dovvne.* I anſwer againe, 1. though Moſes ſpeak generally of *ſerving* their Gods, yet this ſhewes not that they had any place of ſolemne worſhip, wherein they did not ſacrifice alſo: The high mountaines, hilles, and greene trees, whereof Moſes ſpeakes were the ordinary places, where they did ſacrifice as appeares throughout the p ſcriptures: And the Iſraelites following the manners of the heathens herein alſo, did offer ſacrifices in their owne private q houſes vnto the hoſte of heaven and vnto other falſe Gods. 2. Even you yourſelf have not brought any one inſtance or ſhew of proofe to manifeſt vnto vs, that theſe Idolatours had any ſet places of worſhip either publique or private, wherein they did not ſacrifice as well as they prayed or performed any other ſervice. And what weight is there then in a meere coniecture and ſuppoſition, againſt a common and generall practiſe deſcribed vnto vs by the teſtimony of holy writte?

p 2. Kin. 17 8. --11. & 1 Kin. 22. 43. Eſa. 57. 5. 6. 7. Ier. 3. 6. with 17. 2. 3. Ezek. 6. 13. & 20. 28. Hoſ. 4. 13. 2. Kin. 23. 12. Ier. 19. 13. Zeph. 1. 5.

Your ſecond reply is, that *though there vvas to be but one place for ſacrificing, yet foloweth it not that that vvas the cauſe, (at leaſt the onely cauſe) vvhy heathniſh idols and idoleies ſhould be deſtroyed, but for that they vvere divils and divils houſes, &c.* I anſwer, 1. I ſayd not, that the commandement for one place of ſacrifice, was the *onely cauſe* why Idol-places ſhould be deſtroyed; your denyall thereof is idle and beſide the matter; and tends to deceive your reader, in making him to think that I had affirmed the ſame. 2, that the commandement of a peculiar ſet place of ſacrifice was one cauſe it may appeare by the coherence of the text and by the oppoſition betwixt the actions ſpecifyed in *Deut.* 12. for whereas the deſtruction of the Idolatrous places is commanded *verſ.* 2, 3, 4. the vſing of one place alone which God ſhould chooſe to put his name there, is alſo immediately taught & appoyn-

poynted in the ſame place, and in the *verſ.* 5. next following. 3, as for their being *devils houſes*, which you alledge as the cauſe of their deſtruction, that is without warrant, as hath bene ſhewed before: and may further appeare by this: becauſe then every private Idolaters howſe, yea and every obſtinate ſinners houſe ſhould be deſtroyed, and be vnlawfull for vſe, ſeing all ſuch perſons are called r devilles and Children of the devill and therfore their howſes, devilles howſes. 4, thoſe two places of ſcripture *Exod.* 23. 24. *Deut.* 7. 25. 26. are in a double regard miſalledged by you, for firſt they ſpeak not a word for the aboliſhing of Idolatrous places, which is the queſtion: but onely of the Idols themſelves; and ſecondly, if they did ſpeak of aboliſhing the places, yet doth it not thēce appeare, that it ſhould be vpon this ground, becauſe they are devilles howſes, which is the poynt, that in this place remaines to be proved of you. 5, As for Iaakobs practiſe, *Gen.* 34. 2. 3. 4. there is nothing ſayd touching the deſtruction of any place defiled by Idolatrie, but of other things of leſſe neceſſary vſe, of which more is to be ſpokē hereafter, where that ſcripture is againe alledged by you. And what meane you to tell vs of Moſes deſtroying the Idol, or golden Calfe *Exo.* 32. 20. as though there were no difference betwixt an Idol and the place where it ſtood? How often do you turne away from the queſtion of *the place*, to an other queſtion touching images themſelves? 6. As for the deſtruction of Idols and Idol-temples *in other lands alſo as Egypt, Moab, Babylon, &c. Where no one place vvas choſen for ſacrifice*: touching that which was done in Egypt, *Ier.* 43. 12. 13, *and Ezek.* 30, 13. you have bene anſwered already in the third ſection going before: And yet further you may obſerve this, that if the fact of Nebuchadnezzar in deſtroying Idolatrous countries and houſes may thus be alledged as a rule to be followed of neceſſitie, you may as well plead that the houſes of other ſinners are to be deſtroyed and not to be dwelt in, becauſe of his and other princes decrees to t pluck downe and deface them for blaſphemy, hindring the building of temple, &c. Then ought you not to have vſed that

r Ioh. 6. 70. & 8. 44. Act. 13. 10.

t Dan. 3. 29 Ezra, 6. 11.

place which the blasphemous Iewes had once possessed and inhabited before you. Touching Moab & Babylon, *Ier.*48.7.13 & 50,2. The prophet sayth nothing there touching the places themselves, but onely for the Idols *Chemosh, Bel, Merodach*: of which our question is not. And in summe touching all these nations togather, though no one place was chosen in them for sacrifice; yet seing one place was chosen then in Ierusalem for all the godly in the world to sacrifice in, and no other allowed for sacrifice in any of these nations: even in this respect also the vse of such places, were doubly vnlawfull at that time, once for their sacrifices, and againe for their Idol sacrifice.

Your third reply is, that *if we look vpon the thing figured by that one place, it will lead vs from these Idol-temples now, rather then to them, &c.* But I answer, though Christ and his Church were figured by the temple of old: though Christ have no concord with Belial, nor his Church any agreement with Idols, as you alledge from 2 *Cor.*6.15 16. yet what is this to the vse of those temples from whence Belial and the Idols are cast out? Though a Legion of devilles have dwelt in any living temple or other place, yet when they are cast out and dispossessed, cannot Christ enter in and dwell there, vnless he hold a concord and agreement with them? That no agreement is to be had with Belial and Idols, we graunt willingly, but that the worship of God in the places whence they are cast out is an agreement with them, we deny: for proofe of this, which is the poynt, you have sayd nothing at all.

In the next place you reply divers things also touching *the difference of place which is now taken away* Iohn. 4. 21. You say, *Seing Christ, to bring in the true spirituall worship, would not onely end, but even* t *destroy the citie and the sanctuarie, how can we think, that he would have the idolie of the Samaritans stand vndestroyed; or the abominations that his enimie Antichrist should afterwards erect?* I answer, 1. For that place, *Dan* 9.26. though the Angel *Gabriel* there shew that the sanctuary should be destroyed, yet doth he not shew that it was vnlawfull for Christians afterwards

t Dan.9.26

wards to have met togather for the spirituall worship of God in the same place: And therfore that kinde of destruction is nothing to the purpose, being nothing like vnto that which you plead for, even to the removing of the lawfull publique worship of God, for ever out of the place defiled by Idol-service. 2, as *Gabriel* foretels the destruction of the sanctuary, so in the very same verse he foretelles the slaughter of the *Messias*: both these were to be done by the providence of God, according to the determinate counsell of his will; neither of them according to his law by any warrant of his word, but both of them by the authoritie of the cruell and wicked Romanes, which both destroyed the temple and slew Christe: Their fact in destroying the temple was abominable, even t the *abomination of desolation*: so that if you have no better arguments for throwing downe our temples, then this example; your destruction of them shall be but an abhominable desolation, without any warrant of Gods word. 3, The Angel in this place doth shew the vvill of God as well for the destruction of the citie it self as of the sanctuary: so that for ought in this place, you might as well have collected and concluded the destruction of Idolatrous cities and the private houses of Idolaters, as the destruction of the temples abused vnto Idolatrie.

t Dan.9.27 with Mat. 24. 15. & Luk. 21. 20.

But for the confirmation of your opinion, you plead further from that text *Ioh.*4.21. and say, *First, it sheweth that God shalbe worshiped, neither in the mount of Samaria (where they committed Idolatry) nor in Ierusalem, (where the typical worship had bene for a time.) Whereupon it followeth, that Antichrist hauing erected temples for Idols, in imitation of Ierusalems temple purposely in the parts and shape as the Papists acknowledge, &c. We are rather to conclude that God is not to be worshiped in them.* I answer, 1. The denyall of worship in the mount of Samaria and Ierusalem, is not absolute, but the meaning is that men should not be tyed to those places; and therfore Christ opposeth not any other locall place vnto those two, but onely opposeth the maner of worship in spirit and truth, which might be now in any

places

u 1 Tim. 2. 8. u places without exception. 2, Though our temples had bene made liker vnto the temple in Ieruſalem then they are: yet doth it not folow that it is vnlawfull to worſhip God in them: for proofe of this conſequence you bring nothing: And as for the conſecration of them and your teſtimony of Bellarmine, they are to be examined in the next Chapter, where you repeate the ſame at large.

Secondly, you plead from *Ioh. 4. 23. 24.* that *Chriſt there teacheth all men to worſhip God in ſpirit & truth: which are oppoſed both to figurative worſhip and falſe worſhip, &c.* I anſwer, though Antichriſts temples in his vſe of them are a part of his falſe worſhip: yet doth not that pollute vs in our vſe of our owne temples, being quite contrary vnto his. The Iewes temple wherein you worſhipped God after them, was in their vſe of it a part of their falſe worſhip, (as is anone more fully to be manifeſted,) was your vſe of it therfore condemned by *Ioh. 4?*

Thirdly, you plead, that *We cannot in reaſon think, that there ſhould be more indifferencie of place nowe, then there is of other things, &c.* I anſwer, that we are to diſtinguiſh betwixt things of neceſſary vſe and other trifles: A place for the worſhip of God is of neceſſary vſe: and thoſe which we have are of great conveniency for vs, being civil helpes in the ſervice of God: & therfore we vſe them with good conſcience, ſeing all things are pure vnto the pure, *Tit. 1. 15.* But as for cope, mitre, ſurplice, and ſuch like we do juſtly refuſe and reiect them, being vaine inventions that are of no neceſſary vſe at all in the ſervice of God.

Whereas you ſay further, that *according to my manner of pleading for Idolies, the Corinthians (whom Paul convinced of ſin for eating in the idolie, by an argument of Iſraels practiſe) might alſo have pleaded, that thoſe things concerned Iſrael which were a ſpecial people, &c.* I anſwer, that you compare things together very groſly: for Paul convinced the Corinthians of ſin for eating in the Idol-houſe with the Idolaters, at that time and place when they

they did inſtantly committ Idolatrie, thoſe Idol-feaſts being a part of their worſhip, as hath bene ſhewed before from *1 Cor. 10. 7. 21.* but you in vaine ſeek to convince vs of ſin for the lawfull worſhip of God in thoſe places from whence the Idols and Idolatry are remooved: Now I pray you, what proportion or ſimilitude is there betwixt theſe two things: viz. Communion in the true worſhip of God with the faithfull in a place purged from Idolatrie; which is our caſe: & Communion in an Idol-feaſt an Idolatrous worſhip, this with heathniſh Infidelles, even in the place where the Idolles ſtood, and were preſently worſhipped; which was the caſe of the Corinthians? Let him that readeth judge, whether the Corinthians could make the like plea for themſelves that we do.

Finally as for your comparing of our defence vnto the plea of ſome Papiſts in expounding the ſecond commandement itſelf to be *a temporall precept*, which opinion of *Catharinus* even Bellarmine himſelf refuted in the place alledged by you: I anſwer, that any few might as lawfully tell you the ſame, and ſay vnto you, *even as you hold and plead for the abrogating of the ſacrifices and ceremonies of the law: ſo ſome Papiſts have alſo pleaded againſt the ſecond commandement itſelf, that it was a temporall precept*: If his compariſon ſhould be vniuſt againſt you: ſo is yours againſt vs.

CHAP. VIII.

The Second reaſon concerning temples, examined.

OVr 2. reaſon againſt them is, Becauſe ſo long as they are continued, Antichriſt with his abominations is not wholly aboliſhed, as the Lord hath appointed, and will effect in his time, Rev. 17. 16. and 18. 11. 12. 13. 2. Theſſ. 2. 8. 2 King. 10. 26. 27. 28. Hen. Ainſ.

This argument you deny: and ſay, The 3. firſt allegations ſhew that Antichriſt ſhalbe conſumed: but they ſhew not that our Temples

are

are any of his abomination. The 4. allegation is taken (you say) from the policie of Moses; that is now abrogate.

I answer; if we had brought this reason against the Mass, or any other of Antichrists synns, you might even as wel have denyed our argument, and be a pleader for all poperie: seing the Masse it self is not named in any of those places, more then his temples. But if they shew that he (with his abominations) is to be abolished, as you deny not: it will soon appeare that your temples are a part of them.

a Rev. 18. 11 12.

First therfore, the text a mentioneth the merchandize of the whore, which no man should buy: naming Gold, silver, precious stones, pearles, byss, purple, scarlet, &c. Vessels of wood, brass, yron, marble, &c. *Here I hope you understand not these things of merchandise properly, but (as is throughout the Revelation) to be an allusion to the* Prophets, *and in this place to the merchandise of* b Tyre. *For you that are so large for the popes idols and idoleies, if there may be any necessary vse of them; it is not to be thought that you wilbe so strayt as to forbid men to buy these civil wares of Papists, or merchants now to trade with Spaine or Italie. Secondly then, to prove that your temples are Antichrists Merchandise, and none of the meanest: I wil bring you into the Popes owne ware house, his Romane Pontifical, and other shops of his, where you may see it with your eyes. And first by the decree of Pope* Nicolas, c *it is not lawfull for any man to build a Church or temple, without Commandement or leave of the* Pope *and Apostolik See. Then, vnto the place where a temple is to be built, & where a crosse is set to hallow it, cometh* d *a Bisshop with his Miter, and sprinkleth the place with holy water, and prayeth God to visit that place, through the interceding merits of the Virgin Marie, and* S*t*. N. *(naming the hee saint or shee saint vnto whose honour and name the Church shalbe founded) and all other saints: and by infusion of his grace, to purifie it from all pollution, &c. Then they say, the stone which the builders refused, that is become the head of the corner: Thou art Peter, and vpon this Rock I will build my Church: Glorie be to the Father, &c. Then sprinkling the stone with holy water, and graving the signe of the crosse vpon it: he prayeth God to blesse that creature of stone, that it may be a saving remedie to mankinde: and that*

b Ezek. 27.

c De consecr. dist. 1. c. Ecclesia.

d Pontifical. de bened. primi lapidis pro ecclesia ædific.

that whosoever shal afford help with a pure minde to build vp that Church, may have both health of bodie, and cure of soule. Then placing that first stone on the foundation, with crossings in the name of the Father, &c; it becometh a place destinate for prayer: and they sing, How fearfull is this place! surely this is no other then the house of God, and the gate of heaven, &c. When the Church is builded, and is to be dedicated; e *the Archdeacon is to signifie to clergie and people, that they fast before it be consecrated, and so must the Bishop do that consecrateth it. And the evening before, the Bishop prepareth the reliques which are to be inclosed in the Altar, putting them in a vessel, with three graines of frankincense, and a writing on parchment signifying whose reliques are there inclosed, and to whose honour and name, the Church and Altar is dedicated, &c. In the morning, they make ready holy chrisme, holy oile, two pound of frankincense, a censer, ashes, salt, wine, an hyssop sprinkle, five litle crosses for the Altar, two vessels of holy water: and they paint twelve crosses on the Wall. The Bishop conjureth the salt, sprinkleth the holy water, and then they sing, Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssope, and I shalbe clean, &c The house of the Lord is founded on the top of the mountaines, and exalted above all hills, and all nations shal come vnto it, &c. The Bishop with his pastoral staff, smites the Church dore, saying, Lift, vp your gates ye Princes, and be ye lifted vp ye everlasting dores, and the King of Glorie shal come in: and a Deacon that is locked within, sayth, Who is this King of Glorie? The Bishop answereth. The Lord strong and mightie, the Lord mightie in warr. Then going about the outside of the Church, he cometh and knocketh the second time, with like words: and so againe the third time, & then he addeth,* Open, Open, Open. *Then the dore is opened, and he goeth in with his clerks, (having first made the signe of the crosse to drive away all phantasmes) and he sayth, Peace be to this houses: the Deacon answereth, By thy coming in: and all say, Amen: and sing, Everlasting peace be to this house, &c. Then ashes are sprinkled on the Church floor, & the Bishop with his pastoral staff, writeth on the ashes, the Greek and Latine Alphabets. He blesseth water with salt, ashes and wine: conjuring first the salt, that it may drive away the Fiend, and may profit them*

e Pontifical. de eccles. dedicat.

that take it, to health of ſoule and bodie: and conjureth, the water, to repell the Divil from the borders of the juſt, and that he be not in the ſhadow of that Church: he prayeth the Lord to powr out the holy Ghoſt into that his Church and Altar, that it may profit to health of body & ſoule vnto them that worſhip him: to ſend an Angel from heaven, to bleſſe and ſanctifie thoſe aſhes, that they may be an healthful remedie to all that implore his name: and that they which ſprinkle themſelves with it for redemption of ſynns, may perceive health of bodie and protection of ſoule. He bleſſeth the wine, and maketh a mixture of water and wine and ſalt & aſhes for the conſecrating of that Church and Altar: and prayeth God to ſend the Holy Ghoſt vpon that wine, to profit the conſecration of that Church: to ſend a ſhowre of grace vpon that houſe, to give all good, repell all evil, deſtroy the Devil: that to the viſiters of that houſe, there may be peace: that he will bleſſe & keep that Habitation by the ſprinkling of that water mixt with ſalt, wine and aſhes: that he would repell darknes from it; infuſe light, that it may be Gods own houſe, and the Fiend may have no leave to do hurt therein. Then they ſing, this is Gods houſe, firmly builded, well founded on the firm rock: this is no other but the houſe of God, and gate of heaven. They pray God to infuſe his grace on that houſe of prayer, that the help of his mercie may be felt of all that there call on his name: that his eyes may be open to that houſe day & night: that he would favourably admitt every man that comes to adore him in that place: that there the Preiſts may offer ſacrifices of praiſe, the people may pay their vowes: that in that houſe by the grace of Gods ſpirit, the ſick may be healed, the blind cured, Lepers clenſed, Divils caſt out, and the bonds of all ſynns vnlooſed. Then call they the ſaincts of God to enter into the citie of the Lord, for a new Church is builded for them, where the people ought to adore Gods Majeſtie. Then the Biſhop makes a ſhort Sermon to the people, of the vertue and privileges of the dedication of the church, of Tithes, and other eccleſiaſtical fruits to be payd &c. and ſo the founder and people promiſe to fulfyll the Biſhops commandements. Indulgences are granted to all faithfull Chriſtians, for one yere: and in the yerely day of the conſecration of that Church, 40. dayes indulgence to all that viſit it. They pray that God would enter into

into his houſe, and that that houſe which is made ſolemne by that dedication, may be made high by his habitation. And the Biſhop ſayth, this temple be hallowed and conſecrated, in the name of the Father, & of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, to the honour of God, and of the glorious virgin Marie, and all ſaints, and the memorie of S. N. Peace be vnto thee. Then conſecrateth he all the clothes, garments, &c. for that Church: and prayeth God to illuſtrate by his habitation that Temple of his Majeſtie: to grant that all which ſhal come thither to pray, out of whatſoever tribulation they cry vnto him, may obteine the benefit of his conſolation. Theſe temples, whoſe adorning conſiſteth [f] partly in the very frame or fabrik, partly in the images, croſſes, veſtments, &c. are builded [g] after the form of Solomons temple, with three parts, and the moſt holy towards the eaſt, (differing therin from the Iewes temple, for a popiſh myſterie) and are erected [h] for 4. ends: for ſacrifice, called therfore Temples: *for prayer, and therfore called* Oratories: *for to keep the relicks of martyrs, called therupon* Baſiliks *or* Martyries: *and for to feed the people with the word and Sacraments, called therfore Churches. And to goe on [i] pilgrimage to theſe and other like holy places, is pious and religious: and they are worthily eſtemed [k] holy and Venerable, & indued with a divine vertue. This place, to weet [l] the* material Church, *is holy: for it is hallowed to this end, that there the Lord may hear mens prayers, & therfore [m] it giveth holynes to them that pray therin. Now let theſe things ſpeak, whether your temples be not a notable part of Antichriſts abominations: & therfore by Gods word & ſpirit (according to 2. Theſ. 2.8.) and by the Magiſtrates ſword (according to Rev. 17.16.) to be aboliſhed, & dealt with as was [n] Baals houſe, which example is of perpetual moralitie for the ſubſtance of it, & not of Moſes policie now abrogate, as before I ſhewed. If the Faith & ordinances of the goſpel, be Chriſtians merchandiſe, which we are called to buy, Eſai. 55.1. Rev. 3.18. then are theſe popiſh ordinances & idolatries, Antichriſts wares, which no man ſhould buy, Rev. 18.11. If Solomons temple which he builded for [o] ſacrifice and prayer & for God to dwel in, was a part of the Iewes religion, as all the ſcripture witneſseth: and the deſtroying of it by the heathens, was a ſynn againſt the true God and his*

f Bellarmin. de cult. ſanct. l. 2. c. 6.
g Ibidem. c. 3.
h Ibidem c. 4.
i Ibidem c. 8.
k Ibidem c. 5.
l Durand. Rational. l. 7. c. de feſto dedicat.
m præſtat' orantibus ſanctitatem.
n 2. King. 10.
o 2 Chron. 2.6. & 6.2. 20.29.

his ordinances, as the 79. Psalme teacheth vs: if the temples also of the gentiles were a part of their religion and idolatrie; as we may learne by their own testimonie, calling their Temples p holy and religious: *by their practise, as when* Antiochus *appointed* q Chappels of Idols (*or* Idolies) *to be set vp; and by their profession, as the Townclerk of Ephesus boasted of their devotion to their goddesse* Diana, *in that their citie was her* r Temple keeper *or Sexton: and finally by the Apostles doctrine, who as he calleth thier false Gods and images Idols, so their temples he calleth* s *Idolies, and blameth the Christians for eating idolothytes in those places: then can it not be denyed, but these temples of yours, are Antichrists idolies, a part of his religion or abomnation rather, to be loathed of all good Christians, and ought (by evidence of the scriptures forealledged) to be destroyed. And you that vse them for two of those 4. ends for which Antichrist consecrated them, namely for places of prayer, and of ministration of the Word & Sacraments: do so far forth pertake with his abominations. And that the Pope traffiqueth with these temples, as with his other vvares, even for the maintenance of his Kitchin also: a Frier* t *a Poet of his, testifyeth saying,* Venalia nobis

Templa, Sacerdotes, Altaria, Sacra, Coronæ.

So that to him it should be sayd, as to Tyrus of old: u *Thou hast defiled thy Sanctuaries, by the multitude of thine iniquities; by the iniquitie of thy traffique: therfore wil I bring forth a Fyre from the midst of thee, and I wil bring thee to ashes vpon the earth, in the sight of all them that behold thee.*

p Cicero Act. 6, in Verrem. q 1. Mac. cab. 1. 47. r Neocoron. Act. 19. v. 35. s 1. Cor. 8. 10. & 10. 20, 21.

t Bapt. Mantuan.

u Ezek 28. 18.

Answer.

Io. Pa. THe reason why I denyed our temples to be the abominations of Antichriste, was not because they are not *named* in your allegations, as you vvould make the reader to beleeve: but because the scriptures alledged by you do *not shew* it at all; I know vvell that the scriptures do *shew* many things to be evill and abominable, which are not at all *named* in them. How vniust then is your inference from this pretext, viz.

viz. *that I might as vvell have denyed such a reason against the masse, seing the Masse it self is not named in any of those places, more then his temples.*

But to prove that our temples are a part of his abominations, you do further vrge both the scriptures, and popish writings: And *first* you say, *the text, Rev. 18. 11. 12. mentioneth the merchandise of the vvhore, vvhich no man should buy; naming Gold, silver, precious stones, &c.* And you *hope I vnderstand not these things of merchandise properly, &c.* I answer, 1. Suppose this merchandise is not to be vnderstood properly, must our temples therfore needs be a part thereof? you have not yet brought so much as a colour of any proofe for this, out of the scriptures alledged. 2, That *Gold and silver*, and such like things even properly taken are the merchandise of Rome, as well as other spirituall things, it appeareth evidently, by the infinite treasures & summes of money which that Church hath extorted from the nations of the earth, and divided the spoyles thereof among her merchants: even by your owne testimony out of *Mantuan*, the *crownes* and diademes of princes were sold at Rome vnto such as would buy. All stories shew, that even civill principalities, Kingdomes, Empires were bought and sold at Roome: the pope setting on the Emperours crowne with his feete, and with his foote againe dashing it from the head. 3, vvhat though there be *an allusion vnto the Prophets through out the revelation, and in this place also to the merchandise of Tyre*, as you alledge? This hinders not but that many things in such allusions may be vnderstood properly. The Angel that proclaimes the destruction of Roome, a alludes vnto the destruction of Babylon: yet I hope you vvill not deny but that the destruction of the very citie of Rome it self taken properly, may be vnderstood thereby as vvell as the religion it self that is to be abolished; as in Babylon of old. 4, though I do not absolutely condemne all trade in civill wares vvith Spaine and Italy, whereof you speak also; yet this helps you not: for neither are all the merchandise mentioned in *Rev.* 18. counted for the abhomina-

a Rev. 18. 2 with Esa. 21. 9. Ier. 51. 8.

tions

tions of Antichriſt: neither are our temples any part of his merchandiſe. The Lord in his judging of Antichriſte will have even [b] civil commodities of Roome to be aboliſhed from that place, not as things vnlawfull for vſe, but yet to be taken avvay from the vvhore for a puniſhment of other ſins.

[b] Rev. 18. 22. 23.

In the next place, after ſtreyning of the ſcriptures, you come vnto the popiſh vvritinges and promiſe *to bring me vnto the Popes owne Ware-houſe*, &c. Ianſvver.

Firſt, though you take vpon you to be our guide to leade vs into the Romane Pontifical and other ſhops of the Pope, yet am I & other to take heed hovv vve follovv ſuch a guide, vvhen before our eyes vve ſee you to ſtumble at the firſt ſtep, and to break your ſhinnes even at the very threſhold of th ſhop you enter into. VVhereas you ſay, *Firſt by the* [c] *decree of Pope Nicolas, it is not lawfull for any man to build a Church or Temple, without commandement or leave of the Pope and Apoſtolik ſea*: you do herein falſify the vvords of the decretal, vvhich doth not ſpeak of *building* a Church without the Popes leave, but of *inſtituting* a church. And this appeares more plainely by the Popiſh *Gloſſe* vpon the next Chapter in the ſame *diſtinction*, which ſaith [d] *Hitherto is ſhewed by vvhoſe authoritie Churches are to be conſecrated, but now by vvhoſe authoritie they are to be built*. VVhereby it appeares that the Author of the Gloſſe interprets the decree of pope *Nicolas* not of *building* as you alledge, but of the *inſtitution* of Churches, according to the words of the decree: Theſe two things are plainely diſtinguiſhed in that place. But as before you dealt vntruely with the [e] Thalmudique canons, and with the [f] canons of the Synods in the Reformed Churches, ſo do you here deale with the popiſh canons. VVhat vncleane fingers haye you thus to defile and corrupt the ſeverall teſtimonies which you meddle withal?

[c] De conſec. diſt. 1. part. 3. c. eccleſia.

[d] De conſecrat. diſt. 1. part. 4. c. Nemo.

[e] Pag. 107.

[f] Pag. 117.

Secondly, what weight or authoritie is there in the Popiſh records of theſe vncertaine and variable decrees? They were ſo often changed and altered, that vpon the credit of them, you cannot ſay of our temples, that they were conſecrated by ſuch autho-

authoritie as is therein appoynted. This vncertainety and variablenes of the decrees, as it might be ſhewed by many other inſtāces, ſo doth it alſo appeare moſt plainely evē touching this poynt of conſecrating churches & this alſo in the tractate alledged by your ſelf: for whereas the text of the decretal ſaith [g] *No Church is to be conſecrated without the authoritie of the pope*: The Gloſſe vpon the ſame place ſaith concerning that decree, *Hodie non tenet*: This decree was then altered: And the explication of this matter is further deſcribed in the ſame place. And thus we ſee that the authoritie of the pope was not neceſſary, either for building or yet for conſecrating of our temples. Theſe things were in the power of the Biſhop, as well as of the pope: and therfore it is alſo written in their law: [h] *The Biſhops can do as much as the Pope in thoſe things which are of the efficacy of cōſecratiō.*

[g] De conſecrat. diſt. 1. par. 3. Cap. De locorum.

[h] Extravagant. Iohan. 22. tit. 5. in Gloſſa.

Thirdly, as there is this difference in the decrees touching the authority bv whom, ſo much more in the divers rites and cuſtomes vſed in the maner of conſecration of temples: This diverſity of rites is confeſſed by themſelves: ſaying, [i] *It ought to be conſidered that in the divine ſervice there is found a variety of manifold rites: for almoſt every Church hath their peculiar obſervations, &c. Therfore let not the minde of the reader be moved: if happily he read in this work ſuch things, as he doth not know to be obſerved in his owne Church: or if he do not finde, whatſoever is there obſerved.* In this regard you cannot ſay of our tēples with any aſurance that thoſe peculiar rites and cuſtomes mentioned by you in this place, were obſerved in the conſecration of them. In ancient time, temples were conſecrated [k] *onely by prayer*; and being once cōſecrated in ſuch manner, they were not to be conſecrated againe with theſe rites, even by the teſtimony of the Popiſh [l] decrees themſelves. Therfore all that you have ſayd touching theſe rites, is a mere vncertainty, eſpecially touching ſuch *Oratories* as this place is wherein our particular congregation doth meet togather for the worſhip of God: This difference they ſhew betwixt oratories and other Churches, viz. that [m] *an Oratorie is not conſecrated, neither hath a dowrie appoynted*,

[i] Durand. rational. in præfat.

[k] Hoſpiniā de Templ. p. 105.

[l] De conſecrat. diſt. 1. part. 7. c. eccleſijs.

[m] Panormitan. de conſecrat. Eccl. Cap. Auctoritate.

ted , neither is made principally that Maſſe *ſhould be celebrated* therein, *but for prayer,&c.*

Fourthly touching the frame and Fabrick of theſe temples *builded* (as you alledge out of Bellarmine) *after the forme of Solomons temple, with three parts and the moſt holy towards the eaſt , differing therein from the Iewes temple for a myſterie,&c.* Herein alſo there is great difference of temples; neither do you ſo faithfully relate the teſtimony of Bellarmine touching this matter as was meet: for he ſpeakes not indefinitely of them as you do , but with ſuch words as imply an exception: vvhen he ſaith of their 3. parts, n *ferè omnes, almoſt all* are ſo built : and of their looking to the eaſt, he ſaith it is *vt plurimum*, for the moſt part implying that ſome are otherwiſe : And his fellow-cardinall acknowledgeth, that ſome Churches, as o that of Gaza by *Eudoxias* meanes made in forme of a Croſſe, were built otherwiſe : differing mainely therein from the forme of Solomons temple. And for the temples of this city they are of divers ſhapes : no one fully like vnto an other: for our temple in particular, it hath not thoſe 3. parts whereby it ſhould reſemble Solomons temple, wanting both *porch* , & *chancel:* ſo that your reaſoning here againſt vs in reſpect of the forme and ſhape of temples (as you did alſo in the former Chapter) is as vaine as any things els.

n Bellarmin. de cult. ſanct. lib. 3. c. 3.

o Cæſ. Baron. Annal. Eccleſ. Tom. 5. p. 140.

Fiftly, as for that which you ſpeak of the *holynes, myſteries*, or myſticall ſignifications aſcribed vnto temples and vnto the rites of their conſecration by Bellarmine, Durandus, and others: they are many of them more different and vncertaine then the rites themſelves : *Durandus* himſelf in the p beginning of his book confeſſeth touching the popiſh rites, that *there are divers ſenſes or ſignifications given vnto the ſame thing, and they paſſe from one meaning to an other:* And the q popes auditour in an Epiſtle printed in the end of the ſame book affirmes that many prieſts, Biſhops, Arch-Biſhops for innumerable yeares had conſecrated, and obſerved their rites and ceremonyes being altogather ignorant what they did: And that *now onely & not before* they vnderſtood the ſame by *Durandus* his explication of thoſe myſteries.

p Rational. divin. offic. in præfat.

q Ioann Aloyſius. ad Cardinal. Tiraſ.

ries. Hereby it appeareth that the myſticall ſignifications of holynes aſcribed vnto temples and other ceremonies were particular opinions invented at length by ſome ſpeciall men, not knowne vnto many of the learnedeſt among the Papiſts , and therfore not obſerved generally as parts of their worſhip.

Sixtly, ſuppoſe that our temples had bene conſecrated ech of them, even in the manner above mentioned by you , yet doth it not follow that they are a part of Antichriſts abhominations, as you would faine have the rites of their conſecration to ſpeak for you. Though in their Idolatrous vſe of them for falſe worſhip, and with vaine confidence in them , they were vnto the Papiſts a part of their abhomination , yet not ſo vnto vs , that reiect thoſe ſuperſtitions and vſe them lawfully in the true worſhip of God : Even as *Golias* his ſword though an inſtrument of cruelty and murder ſerving for the maintenance of heathniſh Idolatry in the hand of the Giant, was yet r lawfully vſed by David as an inſtrument of juſtice to the glory God: yea though happily that ſword were conſecrated with magicall enchantments, according to the maner of the heathen which vſed enchanted armour and weapons. VVhen you conclude from the Chriſtians merchandiſe *Eſai.* 55. 1. *Rev.* 3. 18, that *theſe popiſh ordinances and Idolatries are Antichriſts wares*, you conclude beſide the queſtion : Thoſe popiſh ordinances and Idolatries are in our aſſemblies dayly confuted, condemned and conſumed by the word and ſpirit of Chriſte as *2 Theſ.* 2, 8. and the authority of the Magiſtrate hath *made the whore naked and deſolate* in taking away theſe temples from her and converting them to the true worſhip of God , according to *Rev.* 17. 16. though they be not deſtroyed as Baals houſe was according to the policie of Moſes which is now abrogate ; That which you ſhewed before to the contrary is already anſwered. Though Solomons temple to the Iewes , and the heathniſh temples vnto *Cicero, Antiochus, the Epheſians*, and other heathens in their vſe of them were circumſtances and inſtruments of their religion (for you do vnfitly call them parts of their religion)

r 1. Sam. 17. 51. & cap. 21. 9.

gion) yet the proportion thereof reacheth no further, then to shew that popish temples were vnto the papists instrumēts of their religion in their vse of them: but that our temples in our vse of them are so, you cannot shew from hence. That which you alledge of the heathens sin from *ps. 79.* in destroying the temple is idle, for it was also a syn of the heathen to destroy the private houses of the Iewes. That which you say of the Corinthian Idol-houses hath bene answered before. The testimony of *Mantuan* for selling of temples at Roome, is against yourself, and shewes that our temples are not the Popes merchandise, because he cannot *for the maintenance of his kitchin* sell the same according to the meaning of *Mantuan*: The pope should have but a leane kitchin, if he had no greater revenues then the proffit which he now gets by the sale of our temples. That allegation of *Ezek. 28. 18.* is abused by you, for the Prophet there speakes of the whole city & Kingdō of Tyrus to be destroyed for their sins: and you might from thence as well conclude the destruction of Kings palaces and the private houses of wicked Merchants for their false barganies, and fraudulent dealings as of Idol-temples, for their superstition.

Seventhly, if for the superstitious rites of consecration, our temples ought to be destroyed and abolished, then how comes it that the churchyardes are not lyable to the same judgements, seing they have bene also consecrated by Bishops in like maner with such abhominable rites and Idolatrous superstitions, as the temples were? How can you according to your maner communicate with the churchyard, in the buriall of the dead, and yet deny vs the church, when as the pollution of their consecration is alike for both? your owne [t] Authors tell vs: that *the day before the consecration of the churchyard, five wooden crosses are to be set vp in the churchyard; one higher then the rest in the middest, and other 4. according to the height of a man: one before the middle crosse in the vtmost part of the Churchyard: an other behinde the midle crose in the vtmost part of the Churchyard: a third in the vtmost part on the right hand of the midle crosse: and a fourth in the*

[t] Pontificall. de cæmiterij benedictione.

the vtmost part on the left hand: After this before ech of the 5. crosses an other peece of wood is to be set, that may receive 3. candles on the top of it, ech of them of 3 ounces weight or thereabout: then a ladder is to be set for the Bishop to climbe vp to the top of the crosses: then a vessell full of water to be hallowed, and a vessel full of salt. In the morning the Bishop being dressed in the vestrie with his garments, the albe, girdle, stole, pluvial of white colour, single mitre and pastoral staffe comes with his ministers vnto this churchyard which is to be consecrate, where there is a faldistorie prepared for him before the midle crosse, then he makes a short Sermon touching the holines and liberty of the churchyard: this being done fifteene candles are lighted and fastned, 3 before ech crosse: then the Bishop coming before the midle crosse, layes aside his mitre, and prayes that God who is the keeper of the soules and bodies of the faithfull would look mercifully vnto that duety of their service, and that he would at their coming thither purge, bless, consecrate and sanctify that churchyard that the humane bodies resting there after the course of this life, might after the termes of this life deserve to obtaine the ioyes of everlasting life, &c. After this the Bishop goes to the other 4. crosses likewise, and before ech of them performes his devotions, with prayer, crosses, holy water, songs and other ceremonies too long to be repeated. And being thus consecrate this Churchyard [u] *enioyes the same priviledges that the Church doth: for after it is blest, it becomes a holy place: and is reconciled by the Bishop even as the Church by the sprincling of water solemnely with holy wine and ashes, &c.* And furthermore it is then vsed for a place of Idolatrous and false worship, when as in the dayly burial of the dead, they pray before the graves for the dead and to the dead, &c. Your selfe also do acknowledge these [vv] *holy churchyards to be the abhominations* of the whore: and do there also reckon them with the rest to be *very Gillulim, the lothsome Idols & excrements of the Queen of Sodom, and the filthines of her fornication.* Tell vs now by what meanes you have purifyed these Churchyards for your vse in funeralles, and why the temples themselves may not as well be purifyed for our vse, seing both

[u] Durand. Rational. lib. 1. de eccles. dedicatione.

[vv] Arrow against Idolat. Chap. 5. sect. 18.

have bene alike defiled by their consecration. It will not be sufficient for you to say, that your vse of these Churchyards is onely a civill vse, otherwise then our vse of the temples: for that commandement in *Deut.12.1.2.3.* doth as well condemne the reteyning of such places for civil vse, as otherwise. That commandement is so expounded by *H. Barow*, not onely for the times before Christe, but also for our time when he saith of our temples: x *Againe the Idolatrous shape so cleaveth to every stone, as it by no meanes can be severed from them: whiles there is a stone left stāding vpō a stone. So that neither they can be vsed to the worship of God, nor we have any civil vse of them, seing they are execrable and devote to destruction: so that they that vse such execrable and vncleane things, cannot be cleane, but must needes be defiled with the filthines of these Idols.* By his verdict therfore you must needes be defiled even with the civil vse of these execrable things. And not onely Barow but your self also do condemne the reteyning of these places for civil vse: in that you hold they are to be throwne downe & demolished by the Magistrates sword: for if it were lawfull for the Magistrates to convert these places vnto civil vses, as vnto judgements halles, courts or the like, what needed they to be throwne downe or burnt with fire, as you teach in this place? Yea even in this Chapter you teach that they are to be *dealt with as was Baals house*, which was throwen downe by Iehu, and y a jakes made of it. If these places in respect of former abuse are still to be reputed so base and dishonourable, what meane you to deale so vnnaturally with the bodies of your frendes as to bury them in these Idol-places, places of so great dishonour: yea to execute vpon them the curse that is denounced against such as the soule of the Lord abhorres, even *to cast their carkeises vpon the bodies of these filthy Idols*, as you call them? The calamity which you bring vpon your frends is (according to your owne profession) much like vnto that which Iosias inflicted vpon the Idolaters: he tooke their dead bones out of the graves and consumed them with fire vpon the Altars polluted with Idolatry: you take the dead bones

x Discov. p. 138.

y 2. Kin. 10 27.

z Lev. 26. 30.

a 2 Kin. 23 16.

bones of your frends and bring them to be consumed in those graves which are in the Temples and Churchyards polluted with Idolatry. The Papists sinned greevously against the martyrs of Christ, when they caused them to be buryed in dunghils, as they b dealt with *Iohn Careless*; and the c wife of Peter Martyr: and we count it a remarkable judgement of God vpon d *Boner* the persecuting Bishop, that his body was buryed in the place appoynted for buriall of theeves and murderers: but you (as it seemes) care not to sin against your frends, in causing them to ly vnder the judgement of God by burying their bodies in places more vile & odious then common dung-hilles, yea then common privies even in those polluted places which are as you say, *very Gillulim, the lothsome Idols and excrements of the Queen of Sodom, &c.* Your writings condemne these temples and Churchyards to be thus abhominable in the sight of God and in your owne eyes, even for the present: but your hope and expectation further is that the next Christian Magistrate which riseth vp according to your minde, shall also actually reduce these places vnto the state of Baals house: that *example* of Iehu being (as you say) *of perpetual morality for the substance of it, &c.*

b Ioh. Fox, Acts & Mon. p. 1743. edit. an. 1602.
c Ibidem. p. 1785.
d Ibid. p. 1915.

Eighthly, if our temples formerly defiled with Idolatry, and superstitious rites of consecration are therfore of necessity to be abolished, forsaken and new ones to be sought: then will it also follow that popish baptisme being in like maner defiled with Idolatrous rites, ought by the like necessity to be abolished, forsaken and a new Baptisme to be sought. And while you reteyne among you the Baptisme administred in popery, you can not without partiality refuse our temples. For the declaration of this consequence, you may observe, 1. The pollution of baptisme by so many superstitious ceremonies of crossing, exorcising or adiuration of Devilles, exsufflation, salt, spitle, oyle, &c. is as great as the pollutiō of temples by their cōsecration: yea if there be any difference, rather baptisme is more polluted, as may appeare both by your e owne writings, and might

e Animadvers. p. 68. 69. 72. 73.

might further be manifested out of the Romane pontifical, missal, decretales and other popish writings, if need were: 2. As Baptisme is necessary and ordeyned of God, so is an howse or place of worshp for the faithful to assemble in, necessary & appoynted of God. If therfore the generall commandement of Baptising do warrāt vs to reteyne even that same particular baptisme which was so superstitiously administred at the first, then likewise will the generall commandement of having a place to assemble in, warrant vs to reteyne even the same particular place that was so superstitiously consecrated at the first. 3, if the persons vnlawfully circumcised and baptised in Idolatrous and false Churches, might yet through faith and repentance come to a lawfull & comfortable vse of their former circumcision and baptisme, as your self do g acknowledge: then why can not our repentance and faith as well sanctify vnto vs the places superstitiously consecrated, while we do in like maner disclaime and renounce the superstitions of ech of these? 4. your doctrine touching the reteyning of baptisme doth confirme vnto vs that distinction, which serves for answer vnto your maine obiection against our reteyning of temples: H. Barow sayth h *Peradventure hereupon may be collected that such baptisme as is delivered by an infidel, which never had knowledge of God in Christ, being afterward repented of and sorrowed, that their body hath bene guilty of such profanation, &c, the outward Baptisme may in like maner remaine, and not be repeted when they ioyne vnto the true Church. This may at no hand be brought to passe, neither indeed doth it herehence follow: for easy it is to put difference betwixt an Infidel which never knew God in Christ: and an Apostata which hath had knowledg of, and still outwardly (though corruptly) professeth God and Christ. The one sort know not what the Church, worship and Sacraments meane: the other (though corrupted in their knowledge) yet cary a shew of Church, worship, Sacraments, ministery; yea & hath them though corrupt and adulterate: so there is neither sequele nor comparison betwixt them.* According to this distinction may we answer your reason from *Deut. 12.* and other like scriptures tou-

f Esa. 4. 5. 1 Cor. 5. 4.

g Animadverf. p. 69. 70.

h Discov. p. 119.

touching the abolishing of temples defiled with Idolatry: viz. that it is easy to put difference betwixt heathnish Infidels such as the Cananites were that never knew God in Christ: and the Apostate Church of Rome, which still outwardly (though corruptly) professeth God and Christe, &c. And therfore there is no sequel nor comparison, that the temples erected by Papists should be abolished, because the heathnish temples of pagans and infidels were to be destroyed. Though in other places you will not admit of this distinction but cavill against it, yet this doctrine of Barow (which you h also send vs vnto) doth here plainely confirme the same.

h Animadverf. p. 70.

Ninthly, if the superstitious consecration of places vnto Idolatry do necessarily inferre the destruction of the same, then are private houses and many other implements also of Idolaters to be destroyed: because they also are often hallowed with many superstitious rites, &c. you labour here to prove that *the temples of the gentiles were a part of their religion and Idolatrie*, by the testimony of i *Cicero*, which calleth their temples *holy and religious*: and herevpon inferre that such places ought to be destroyed. If this kinde of arguing be sound, then will it also follow by the testimony of the same oratour that private houses are in like maner to be destroyed, as being a part of the Idolaters religion: for he saith of private honses, k *Quid est sanctius, quid omni religione munitius, quam domus vniuscuiusque civium? hîc aræ sunt, hîc foci, hîc dij penates, hîc sacræ religionis ceremoniæ continentur: hîc perfugium est ita sanctum omnibus, vt inde abripi neminem fas sit.* This testimony ascribes as much holynes to private houses in respect of the *household Gods, Altars, & Ceremonies* of worshp there kept and observed, as the former testimony gave vnto publique temples. To prove our temples to be the merchandise of Rome to be abolished, you alledge *Mantuan*, saying

i Cicero Act. 6. in verr.

k Cic. Orat. pro domo suâ ad pontif.

Venalia nobis
Templa, sacerdotes, Altaria, sacra, coronæ.

And see you not here that ornaments & *crownes* are by this Poët reckoned vp among the Popes wares, as well as temples and Altars?

And what is it that the Pope ſells without ſome conſecration? The *crownes* which he gives are l conſecrate with *prayers, croſſes, holy water*. The like alſo may be obſerved touching the conſecration of m *ſwords* for knights and ſouldiers. And not onely theſe, but a great multitude of other things are alſo conſecrate with holy water in the Romiſh Church, as n herbes, flowers, fruits of trees, and other vnreaſonable creatures: But as o David heretofore refuſed not that the crowne of the Idolatrous King of Ammon ſhould be ſet vpon his head; ſo neither are princes nor people bound at this day, to refuſe either ſwords, crownes or houſes either publique or private, in reſpect of any Idolatrous conſecration wherewith they were once defiled in the Romiſh Church, while themſelves do renounce & diſclaime ſuch ſuperſtition.

l Pontifical. de benedictione coronarum.
m Ibid. de benedictione enſis.
n Sleidan. commentar. lib. 21.
o 2. Sam. 12. 30.

Tenthly, if temples and houſes defiled with ſuperſtitious conſecrations are to be deſtroyed, as being the Popes merchandiſe; then will it alſo follow that the living temples and perſons, as the infants in their popiſh baptiſme, and popiſh miniſters in their ſuperſtitious ordinations and popiſh princes in their coronations being as much defiled with Idolatrous rites, as our temples, are in like maner to be deſtroyed, and leaſt of all to be vſed in the worſhip of God. As for the meaſure of pollution, it were eaſy to make as large a narration and ſtory of ſuperſtitious ceremonies and diviliſh inchantments vſed in the hallowing of theſe infants, prieſts and Princes, as you have made touching the conſecration of temples: but I take it to be needleſs: the matter is plaine out of the p Authors alledged by your ſelf, that you cannot deny the ſame. And as for the aptnes to receive guiltines by pollution; ſhall the dead and ſenſeleſs creatures and inſtruments of ſtone and woodden temples abuſed vnto Idolatry be ſubiect vnto deſtruction: and ſhall not much more the reaſonable creatures, polluting thoſe inſtruments be ſubiect vnto the like judgement? ſhall q Achans tent be burnt and not Achan himſelf? This is the rather to be marked, becauſe r *the ſoules of men* are expreſſely mentioned and reckoned

p Pontifical.
q Ioſh. 7. 24. 25.
r Rev. 18. 13. with 2 Pet. 2. 3.

koned among the vvares and merchandiſe of Antichriſte, ſo as the temples are not. You confeſſe ſ that ſome of yourſelves have bene baptiſed in the times and places of popery; Such perſons defiled with popiſh conjurations and exorciſmes you do not refuſe to communicate withall in the worſhip of God: vvhy then do you blame vs for communicating with temples once defiled, whiles we do as well diſclaime the ſuperſtitious conſecration of temples, as the members of your Church do diſclayme the ſuperſtitious rites of their Baptiſme wherewith they were once polluted? Look well vpon *Iohn De Cluſe* your elder, once an Idolater a popiſh Idol, and defiled with many ſuperſtitious ceremonies: when he ſtands vp to Prophecy among you, conſider that he hath bene an Idol-temple, anoyled, greaſed, ſprinckled, and conjured with many magicall ceremonies: if you can lawfully ioyne with him in the publique worſhip of God, becauſe he hath diſclaymed his former ſuperſtition: then may we lawfully vſe our temples in the worſhip of God, becauſe we alſo have diſclaymed their former ſuperſtitiō. If ſtill you will be frovvard, yet remember this, that ſo often as you allow this man to riſe vp in your aſſembly, and to go before you in any religious action, ſo often doth he riſe vp as a witneſſe for vs, and as a judge againſt yourſelves to condemne you of partiality. I might preſſe you yet further and ſhew how your kinde of reaſoning would lead you even to treaſon and to the deſtruction of lawfull princes in reſpect of the ſuperſtition vſed in their coronations, but I ſpare you herein.

ſ Apol. p. 112.

Laſtly to conclude, how ſoever there are many abhominations and ſinfull abuſes of ſcripture in the popiſh maner of conſecrating temples, yet this I hold for truth and hope to manifeſt the ſame, that your abuſe of ſcripture perverted for the erecting and conſecrating of your ſeparated Church is as ſinfull as many of the popiſh wreſtings of the ſame. You tell vs how the conſecrating Biſhop ſaith, *Lift vp your gates ye Princes, and be ye lift vp ye everlaſting dores and the King of Glory ſhall come in*: how he knocks at the Church dore three times and then cryes,

Open, Open, Open: yourself cry out against every true Church of God in the world this day, *Come out of her my people: Touch no vncleane thing; What concord hath Christ with Belial*: Making as it were a crosse vpon every Church dore, you cry *Shut vp, Shut vp, Shut vp*; because Antichriste the King of Babel is there still with sundry of his abhominations. You tell vs that in the popish consecration they sing concerning the new founded church, *surely this is no other then the howse of God, and the gate of heaven, &c.* but touching your new founded Church, you sing in a higher streyne, and say in effect: *surely there is no other house of God, where a lawfull communion may be had, but in this our church: there is no other gate of heaven then this, &c. All other Churches or temples are Devilles and Devilles houses, &c.* The communion of the Reformed Churches is vnto you an t *Apostasy*: and therfore *Iohn De Cluse* separated from the French Church, not daring to enter into heaven by the gate of life opened in their Church, as though there were no other gate of heaven, or lawfull entrance into the Kingdome of God, but by your separation. You tell vs how the consecrating Bishop *maketh crosses* and *coniureth salt and water* to drive *away Phantasmes, to drive away the fiend, to repell the Divel, &c.* H. Barow speaking of *the* u *learned & best reformed preachers* in the Church of England, saith they are *the most pernitious deceavers*: that vv *the very light of that Church is darknes, & the very smoke of the bottomless pit*: and that *their preaching of the Gospel is of all other the most detestable and pernitious, even the strongest snare and delusion of Satan, whereby he allureth, deceaveth, and holdeth captive the miserable World in the Chaines of transgression, errour, Idolatrie, abhomination and impenitencie, vnto judgement.* Againe he saith: x *As for the comfort receaved by their preaching yt having no promise of blessing in the Word of God (your Church & whole ministery being accursed) is rather a fearfull signe of the effectuall working of their delusions, then any reason whereby you may assure your selves or justify them in their vngodly proceedings, whom the Word of God in all their works condemneth.* This is *the coniured salt* of the separation to vnhallow the Church of God: this is your

t Ans. to Th. white pag. 26.

u Discov. p. 144. 145.

vv Ibid. p. 164.

x Ibid. p. 154.

your *holy Water* wherewith you sprinckle the faithfull ministers and people of Christe. You tell vs that at the consecration of the popish temples; *Indulgences are granted to all faithfull Christians for one yeare: and in the yearely day of the consecration of that Church, 40. dayes indulgence to all that visit it.* This their practise of giving *Indulgence* or pardons is very grosse: and yet your doctrine and practise of giving Indulgence is as bad: To those that visit your Church and joyne vnto it you give Indulgence and pardon of all their sins: and pronounce blessednes vnto them, in their visible estate: but vnto the godliest and faithfullest servants of the Lord either ministers or people vvhosoever which are in the Church of England, you graunt no indulgence vnto them in their estate, but pronounce the curse of God vpon every one of them without exception. Your Elder *Iohn de Cluse* writes of that Church, that y *there is nothing to be expected from Christ, by any member thereof, but a powring out of his eternal Wrath vpon them.* And againe exhorting all to leave that Church, in the same book he saith, z *What is there then to be done, even this that every soule who hath any care of salvation, and of escaping the eternall flames of everlasting damnation be carefull to come out with speed from Babylon, &c.* Thus without any *Indulgence*, he leaves them all in the flames of hell: and this he learned from you, who say likewise, a *All that Will be saved are bound by Gods Commandement with speed to come forth of this Antichristian estate, &c.* As you tell vs that the consecrating Bishop, had his clerks to say *Amen* vnto his prayers: so have you *Iohn de Cluse* as your Clerk to say *Amen* vnto your separation. Into your secret let not my soule come. The Popish consecration, and this your separation are both to be abhorred.

y Advertisment against Mr. Brightman p. 9.

z Ibid. p. 11.

a Confessiō of faith. art. 32.

CHAP. IX.

The third reason concerning temples, examined:

Hen. Ainſ. *OVr 3. reaſon againſt them is, Becauſe the conſecrating of any garments, places, or the like, peculiarly to the worſhip of God now in the time of the Goſpel, hath no warrant in the word of God.*

" *You grant this; but yet deny that for the errour of their conſecra-*
" *tion in former time they muſt therfore of neceſsitie be aboliſhed now.*

Seing you grant this, then it foloweth, they are vaine and Idolatrous, Mat. 15.9. Coloſ. 2.22. 23. then are they a part of Antichriſts abominations, and by your grant of our former reaſon, are to be conſumed with him: then are they to be ſhunned of Chriſtians, 1. Ioh. 5. 21. and not to be imployed by them, vnto that vſe for which. Antichriſt conſecrated them, but to be aboliſhed a *by the Magiſtrate. And by ſuch a pretext as you now make, the Corinthians might have pleaded for their ſyn, who* b *did eat in the Idols temple, that the gentiles error in conſecrating it before, could not hinder their libertie, who knew that the Idol was nothing, and the conſecrating of the temple was of no force. Your anſwer alſo ſerveth as wel, for wearing a Miter, a cope, a cornerd cap, a Preiſts cloke, a ſurplice, &c. the errour in conſecrating theſe, is no more then in the temples, if it be ſo much. But in deed you nouriſh the errour of their conſcration, whiles you vſe them for that vnto which they were conſecrate, ſo occaſioning the ſimple people, to eſteme them holy places ſtill: and you give Papiſts occaſion to reproch, who boaſt how their* c *Religion builded all the Churches, &c. and that your religion could not without ſuch their Churches, proviſion and ordinances, ever have caried the exterior ſhew it doeth. And ſo being a means to harden them in evil, your practiſe is an occaſion of offenſe, contrary to the Commandement of God, in 1. Cor. 10. 32.33. And if they can get their temples out of your hands (as they have*

a Rom. 13. 3.4.
b 1 Cor. 8. and 10. ch.
c Papiſts ſupplic. to the K. Año 1604. Art. 6.

have done in ſome townes of theſe countries) you ſhall plainely ſee that the errour of their conſecration continueth as a fretting Leproſie vpon the walls of theſe temples: and even now whiles they are in your hands, they are viſited and prayed in by Papiſts, as holy conſecrated places: yea even by thouſands which are not profeſſed Papiſts, as is to be ſeen throughout the Pariſhes of England. So great is the iniquitie of their inchanted conſecration, which yet remaineth.

Anſwer.

SEing no places now in the time of the Goſpell are to be peculiarly conſecrate vnto the worſhip of God, it followes therfore from hence, that thoſe who do ſo cõſecrate them, and put holynes in them and teach others to do ſo, that ſuch (I ſay) do offend againſt the Scriptures, *Mat.* 15.9. *Col.* 2.22.23. But that we alſo offend, which on the quite contrary do condemne ſuch doctrines and precepts of men, and teach that all places are alike holy and lawfull for the ſervice of God; this conſequence you will not prove in haſt. VVhen you prove that thoſe Tẽples are properly Idolles in our vſe of them, then I wil grant that all godly perſons ought to ſhun them according to 1 *Ioh.* 5.21. and not to communicate with vs in them, and that the Magiſtrate alſo is bound to correct this errour, according to *Rom.* 13.3.4. But if there be any ſuperſtitious perſons that put more holynes in them then they ought, though ſuch in a large ſenſe and metaphorically may be called Idolaters, and be ſayd to make Idols of them, yet this ſin of theirs is not enough to prove that they ought to be aboliſhed: even as the covetous perſons that put their truſt in their riches, and labours and ſay vnto the wedge of Gold, Thow art my hope; may iuſtly be called b Idolaters, & their goods their Idols or gods, yet doth it not follow hence that theſe goods ſo truſted in are to be caſt away or deſtroyed, but onely to be c vſed better and to be ſanctifyed by the word of God. You do here alſo vniuſtly confound Idolatrous places with Idols them ſelves; contrary to ſome of your ſelves

Io. Pa.

b Eph. 5.5. Col 3.5. with Hab. 1.16. and Iob. 31.24
c Luk 16.9 & 19.8.

ſelves who in that peece of paper which is printed in the margẽt of H. Barow his d book for a correction of the ſame, do there plainely diſtinguiſh betwixt *the Synagogs dedicated to Idolatry & defiled with Idols*; and betwixt *Idols which had a worſhip given vnto them*; though that note have other errour amexed vnto it, yet for the diſtinctiõ it ſelf you are further from the truth which it acknowledgeth.

dDiſcov. p. 133.

That which you ſay of the Corinthians eating in the Idols temple, 1. *Cor. 8. & 10. chap.* that they *by ſuch a pretext as I make, might have pleaded for their ſin, &c.* is far otherwiſe: Had they vſed the Idol-temple onely to the lawfull worſhip of God, after all exerciſe of Idolatry had bene baniſhed out of the ſame, then ſhould not the gentiles errour in conſecrating it before, have polluted them: And this is our plea, for our vſe of temples at this time. But what could this excuſe the Corinthians communicating with the Infidels & Idolatours, in the very act of their preſent falſe worſhip, in their Idol-feaſts and ſacrifices, while their Idolatrous exerciſes were ſtill in full force with them? VVhat a huge diſtance is there betwixt theſe two caſes? VVhat Spirit of diſcerning have you, that can not or will not put difference betwixt communion with Papiſts, in the maſſe, in eating of their breaden God, in their Idol temple, which is like the practiſe of the Corinthes; and betwixt communion with true Chriſtians, in true worſhip, in the place purged from Idols and falſe worſhip, which is our practiſe?

VVhereas you obiect further, that my *anſwer ſerveth as well for wearing a miter, a cope, &c. And that I do indeed hereby nouriſh the errour of their conſecrating, &c.* I anſwer, 1. the miter, cope, ſurplice and ſuch like never had nor can have a neceſſary vſe in the ſervice of God, nor be any civil helpes in the ſame, vnto ſuch as have other clothes to put on their backes: but a place & houſe to meet in for the ſervice of God is a neceſſary circumſtance that cannot be miſſed as hath bene ſhewed before: ſo that there being ſuch difference betwixt theſe two things, if ſimple people or Papiſts be offended at that, which is of ſuch vſe,

vſe, their offence is vpon their owne heads onely. 2, Conſider alſo that ſimple people by your vſe of the Churchyards are occaſioned to eſteeme them holy places ſtill: The Papiſts may with like reaſon that they vſed in their ſupplication to the King boaſt that their Religion hath given and conſecrated the Churchyards as well as the Churches: And your practiſe of buriall in theſe places, being that end wherevnto they were conſecrated of Papiſts, is as much an occaſion of offence, and reproch vnto them; doth as much harden them in their errour: and is as much againſt that Commandement *1 Cor. 10. 32. 33.* as is our vſe of the Churches or temples: and if you do not defend your practiſe by the neceſſary vſe which you have of them, you will ly vnder that guilt which you would ſo faine lay vpon vs: where neceſſity excuſeth not, the guilt of offences and ſcandalles doth come vpon men as wel by civil as religious actions. And further according to your obiection, conſider that if the Papiſt can get their conſecrated Churchyards, now vſed by you, into their hands againe (as they have already done in ſome townes of theſe countries) you ſhall plainely ſee that the errour of their conſecration continueth with them: and even now whiles you do bury your dead in them, they are viſited and prayed in by Papiſts, as holy conſecrated places, &c. And if any difference be, they are like to be offended rather at the buriall in the Churchyards and Churches, then at the worſhipping in them, in as much as they are more ſuperſtitious about the buriall then other ſervices, holding it more lawfull to pray and ſerve God in other places, then to bury in other places. Thus you may ſee, that if there be any force in this your reaſoning, it is all againſt yourſelf.

CHAP. X.

The fourth reason concerning temples, examined:

Hen. Ainſ. OVr 4th. *reason you anſwer not, but alter it. We ſayd, the worſhiping of God in the places, &c. hallowed by himself, was a part of his honour, Deut. 12.5.6 Lev. 17. 3 4, & this you grant. So on the contrary, (ſay we) the worſhiping of God now, in the places, &c. hallowed by Antichriſt, is a part of popiſh devotion. You anſwer, Though it be a part of popiſh devotion, to hallow places for Gods worſhip, &c. yet God requires not the plucking down of them. Thus you ſhun the edge of our argument, who ſpake not here of their hallowing, but of the peoples worſhiping in the places hallowed which being popiſh devotion, & ſo farr forth an honour vnto Antichriſt, it muſt needs be ſyn. So in altering the caſe, you turne your eyes from your own ſyn in worſhiping, to the popes ſyn in hallowing. The Apoſtle to convince the Corinthians, ſheweth that the Iſraelites by eating of the ſacrifices were a pertakers of the altar: ſo they, by eating of the heathenish ſacrifices, were pertakers of their altar. The ſame may be ſayd of the Temple, that the Iſraelites coming thither to b pray communicated with Gods honour therin: ſo they that goe to the heathens or Antichriſtians Temples to pray, communicate alſo with Antichriſts honour; though men deſpiſe Antichriſts idols in word now, as the Corinthians did the heathens idols then.*

a 1. Cor. 10.18.

b 1. King. 8.33.

When againe we compare things thus: As the deſtroying of Gods Temple tended to his diſhonour. Pſal. 79. & the building therof, to the eſtabliſhing of his worſhip, Hag. 1. ſo the raſing of Antichriſts Temples, would be to his diſhonour; & the contrary is in vſing, building & repayring them. To this you give no anſwer, but ſay: It doth not follow that God now requires the plucking down of the (temples) ſeing there is a change of the Law, Heb. 7. 12. Whereas if you conſidered the weight of our reaſon, it muſt needs folow: for God would have Antichriſt to be diſhonoured, and c not honoured or mainteyned in any part

c 2 Theſ. 2 Rev. 13. & 18. chap

part of his curſed devotion: and ſuch our argument ſheweth the raſing or repayring of his temples to be. The ſcripture which you cite, ſerveth nothing for your purpoſe. In Heb. 7. 12. the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of the preiſthood, the Levitical miniſterie: which being changed & abrogate, there muſt of neceſſitie be a change alſo of the Law: ſo their miniſtration ceaſeth, & Chriſt our onely Preiſt, performeth the work of our reconciliation to God. But we ſpeak of the Magiſtracie, whoſe office yet remaineth, and is not abrogated by Chriſt, but by his doctrine eſtabliſhed in Rom 13. and elſwhere. So that the Magiſtrate is d *the Miniſter of God ſtil, (which the legal Preiſt is not,) and hath the ſword to cut of all ſynns, wherof popiſh ſuperſtition is not the leaſt: & with this ſword and office, Chriſt* e *medled not: therfore you cannot in this reſpect without errour ſay, there is a chãge of the Law. But the trueth is, ſeing the Magiſtrate continueth, ther is a continuance alſo of the Law: for how elſe ſhall he doe the work of a Miniſter of God, if he have no law of God to direct him? for the other ſcriptures in our reaſon alleged, Deut. 12. 2 King 10. & 14. & 23. You ſay they are already anſwered: and vnto your anſwers, I have alſo replied before.*

d Rom. 13. 4.

e Ioh. 18. 36.

Anſwer.

Io. Pa.

THe complaint which here you make of my *not anſwering but altering and ſhunning the edge of your argument*, &c. is vaine and vniuſt. Your argument is like vnto an overworne knife, whoſe edge is ſo blunt, that a man cannot eaſily diſcerne the edge from the back of it, nor finde where the force of it lyes: ſo litle cauſe there is to ſhun the ſame for feare of cutting or woundiug. You ſay that *you ſpake not here of hallowing, but of the peoples worſhiping in the places hallowing*: but do you not here ſtill vtter a ſpeech implying a contradiction in it? for what ſenſe or colour of reaſon is there here againſt *the peoples worſhiping* except it be in reſpect of *the places hallowed?* do you not alſo in the beginning of this Chapter twiſe together make mention of hallowing when you repeat your argument, and tell vs that you ſayd thus: *The worſhiping of God in the pla-*

ces,&c. hallowed *by himself was a part of his honour. So on the contrary, the worshiping of God now in the places,* &c. hallowed *by Antichrist, is a part of popish devotion?* Againe, in my answer also I did not onely mention *hallowing*, but also which you omit, I mentioned, *putting of religion in* places hallowed, & vnder that I comprehended such kind of vnlawfull worship as the Papists vse, & yet still denyed the consequence of your argument, against such vse as we have of them, when as I sayd, *yet followes* it not that God requires the plucking downe of such places.

see before Pag. 22.

But let vs further examine, whether now vpon the second whetting, and putting of more strength to it, your blunt Axe have got a sharper edge to hew downe our temples. You alledge the conviction of the Corinthians for eating of heathnish sacrifices from *1 Cor. 10. 18.* but that plea is already twise answered: that place speakes of communion with f Idolaters in false worship, and not of vsing the place onely, in a lawfull worship of God. You alledge *1. Kin. 10. 33.* to shew, that *the Israelites coming to the temple to pray communicated with Gods honour therein, &c.* But I answer, that *Solomon* there speakes of true worship in the temple: otherwise those that came to the temple to pray and worship with Idolaters, as in the dayes of g *Manasses*, and h afterwards when the house of God was filled with Idols, did not communicate with Gods honour hereby, but with the honour of Devilles & so on the cõtrary to make the opposition just & equall, those that go to pray in the temples of Antichristians, when as the Idolatry of Antichrist is purged out and removed thence, and do onely vse the worship appoynted of God, praying and fighting dayly against Antichrist with the sword of the spirit, such do not herein communicate with Antichrists honour, but with the honour of Christe.

f 1 Cor. 10. 17. 21.

g 2. Kin. 21 4. 5. 7. Ezek. 8. 3. 16. Ier. 32. 34.

Againe, as if your comparison were an argument with two edges, you say that you also *compare things thus; As the destroying of Gods temple tended to his dishonour ps. 79, &c. so the rasing of Antichrists temples would be to his dishonour, &c.* The sequele of this argument for the necessity of plucking downe our temples,

ples, I denyed, because there is a change of the law, *Heb. 7. 12.* This you call *no answer*, &c. I answer you againe more plainely and fully, 1. Though God would have Antichriste to be dishonoured: and though the rasing of his temples would in some regard be a dishonour vnto him: yet are not we bound vnto all meanes, nor yet vnto this particular meanes and maner of dishonouring him by destruction of his temples: even as God would have Idolaters to be dishonoured, and the i destroying of their goods and cattell, their city and their habitation would be to their dishonour: yet doth it not follow, that we are now bound vnto this meanes and maner of dishonouring them, as hath bene shewed before, because there is a change of the law. God would have blasphemers to be dishonoured; and the k plucking downe of their houses, would be to their dishonour: yet doth it not follow that we are now bound vnto this particular maner of dishonouring them.

i Deut. 13. 15. 16.

k Dan. 3. 29.

2. Whereas you do alledge three Chapters at randon and at large, viz. *2 Thes. 2. Rev. 13. and 18.* to shew that God would have Antichrist dishonoured, and not honoured, &c. you do but beat the ayre in vaine, vnless you could have inferred thẽce that *our not honouring* of him could not stand without plucking downe his temples. 3. Touching the change of the law, *Heb. 7. 12.* you say *the Apostle speaketh of the Priesthood and leviticall ministerie, &c. but we speak of the Magistracie, whose office remaineth, &c.* But if you did seriously consider what you say, you might easily discerne the truth that I shewed you. For though the office of Magistracie continueth according to *Rom. 13.* yet if the Priesthood and leviticall ministery be abrogate, then is a great part of the Magistrates charge abrogate also: seing the Magistrates before Christ were l bound to see the Priesthood and ceremoniall ordinances belonging vnto the same, mainteyned: and to execute judgements vpon the violatours thereof: Those ceremoniall ordinances ceassing, the care and charge of the Magistrate about the same, ceasseth also. And so the commandement of destroying places abused vnto Idolatrie, being

l Exo. 32. 15. Lev. 17. 4. 14. Numb. 1. 51. & 3. 38 & 18. 7. Deut. 17. 12. with ps. 101. 8.

being one of those ceremoniall ordinances, *Touch not, handle not Col.2* as is shewed before: though the office and authority of the Magistrates continueth for the maintenance of the decague or morall law: yet this ceremony concerning observation of places being changed, the authority of the Magistrate is therein changed also. 4. your allegation of *Ioh. 18. 36.* to shew that *Christ medled not with the sword and office of the Magistrate*, &c. is both needless, if you alledge it to prove the continuance of the Magistrates office which is not denyed: and insufficient also, for if he had medled with the sword of the Magistrate, would it therfore follow that the office of Magistracy had bene abrogate? Nothing less: no more then it followes that the office of ministery is abrogate, becaus Christ medled with that sword of the spirit in preaching of the Gospel. As for *Deut.12. 2. Kin.10, &c.* where as you say that you have before replyed vnto my answers: so have I before answered you, and refuted your replyes.

CHAP. XI.

The fift argument, examined:

Hen. Ainsf. "VNto our 5t. reason, frō the examples of godly Princes, that abolished false worship & the monimēts therof, 2 Chr. 17. 2 Kin. 18. & 23. you answer, that they being vnder Moses policie, "are commended for their obedience and practise: but the godly Princes "of our times, not being vnder the same rudiments, are not bound to imitate them herein, further then the equitie before mentioned doth require.

Repl. And how farr equitie requireth, I have before shewed in my answers to your exceptions. But further I pray you tell vs, vnder what policie, touching Iudicials Princes are at this day. If you say, vnder Christs: that I deny, for Princes have their authoritie from a God, who is the b head of Christ. If they had it from Christ, there could be no lawfull Magistrates but Christians: so Pauls doctrine, to be subject to Cæsar, should be overthrowen. Christ hath neyther given power to

Rom. 13. 1. Cor. 11 3.

to Magistrats, nor taken ought from them; but left them as they were authorized of his Father. Eyther then they are vnder Moses policie, (I mean, so as to execute the Iudgements taught of God by Moses) or else they are under none; but may judge and punish as they themselves think good, killing such as God by Moses law would not have to dye, and sparing such as he appointed to death. As for Christ, he hath given them no direction whom and how to punish, otherwise then he gave with God his Father at mount Sinai. And whereas first you say, vnder Moses policie, *& after, speaking of our Princes, that they are not under the same* Rudiments: *you change the word amysse, to restreine Moses Policie vnto his Rudiments. For rudiments, were such legal ordinances as led vnto Christ, and are by him abolished, as the* b *Apostle sheweth, & under them, neyther Magistrats nor people are: but Moses* policie *is more large. And that Gods iudgements against idolatrie, are not such* rudiments, *but of perpetual right, is before manifested. For if the Decalogue given to Israel, remaineth still tous Christians, then the Iudgements due to the transgressions of the Decalogue, remayne also: they being alike vnchangeable, and common to all nations. As for Iewish rudiments, your temples are a sinful reviving of them, after they were dead by Christ. The things appointed of God for his figurative worship, might not be imitated by men for any vse, as the Law in Exod. 30. 32. 33. teacheth vs: and the Hebrewes from thence rightly concluded,* c *It is vnlawful for a man to make an house after the patterne of the Temple. But these your Temples, are purposely made* d *after the forme of the Iewes Temple, as the cope is in imitation of Aarons Ephad, the Surplice like the preists linnen coats, &c. Although Christ at his death ended all these rites. So you in using them as they were built by Antichrist, for places of diuine worship, are faultie for reuiuing rudiments which God hath ceased: but Magistrats in demolishing them, should perform a judgement of eternal equitie, which God hath commanded, Deut. 12.*

b Colos. 2. 20. 21. Gal. 4. 5

c Maimony Beth habchirah. c. 7. s. 10.

d Bellarm. de cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 3.

Answer.

Answer.

Io. Pa. HOw far you have gone astray from equity in your reasoning about equity, I have also shewed before: And am now to proceed vnto those things which you add further.

First, whereas *you deny that Princes at this day are vnder Christ policie, touching Iudicialles*: This yonr denyall appeares to be an errour; because God hath given vnto his sonne Christ not onely a special Kingdome of grace & dominion in his Church; but also a generall and large dominion over all persons & their actions whatsoever, even [m] all power in heaven and in earth; a [n] name above every name that is named, whereat every knee should bow: he is made [o] heire of all, [p] Lord of all, [q] King of Kings and Lord of Lords: how is all power given vnto him, if Princes touching their judicialles be not vnder Christs policie? vvhat authoritie should Christ have to judge and punish Princes for their wicked decrees and judiciall proceedings, to [r] break them with a rod of yron like potters vessels, if they were not vnder him touching judicialles? what needed Princes [s] to kisse the Sonne, to [t] bring their glory and honour vnto the Church for the service thereof, if touching judicialles they were not subiect vnto him? According to your doctrine Princes (though subiect in other things) yet might reserve one knee of Iudiciall authoritie, which they need not bow vnto Christ.

m Mat. 28. 18.
n Eph. 1. 21 Phil. 2. 9. 10.
o Heb. 1. 2.
p Act. 10. 36.
q Rev. 19. 16
r Ps. 2. 9 & 110. 5. 6.
s Ps. 2. 12.
t Rev. 21. 24.

Secondly, whereas for a reason of your former denyall, you alledge that *Princes have their authoritie from God, who is the head of Christ.* This hinders not but that they may have it vnder Christ, who by his Fathers [u] graunt hath all things given into his hand, and therfore even by authority receyved from his Father might change and abrogate some of the judiciall lawes given [h] by Moses.

u Mat. 11. 27. Ioh. 3. 35.

Thirdly: when you say further touching the authority of Princes, *If they had it from Christ, there could be no lawfull Magistrates,*

strates, but Christians so Pauls doctrine to be subiect to Cæsar, should be overthrowne: This is also vnsound: for though there be no Magistrates but Christians, which can lawfully reteyne and vse their authoritie; yet doth it not follow that subiection vnto all other Magistrates is vnlawfull: It is with Magistrates and their dominion and authority as it is with other men in all their possessions and heritages: whosoever is not in Christ is an vsurper and vnlawfull possessour of whatsoever he hath, notwithstanding any right or title that they may have therevnto by the providence of God in respect of humane lawes: because Christ is [v] heire of all things and in him the meek and faithfull onely are the right heires of the world: yet doth it not follow hence that men may take away their goods and inheritances from such. And even so every Magistrate that is not in Christ, is but an vsurper & an vnlawful possessour of whatsoever dominiō or authority he exerciseth, notwithstanding any right or calling that he hath therevnto in respect of men: yet is this no warrant vnto the subiects of such Infidel-Magistrates, to with draw thēselves from their subiection, or to deny obedience and tribute vnto them.

v Heb. 1. 2 Rom 8. 17 Mat 5 5. 1. Tim. 4. 3 8. 1. cor. 3. 21 22. 23.

Fourthly, to that you say, *Christ hath neither given power to Magistrates, nor taken ought from them; but left them as they were authorized of his Father, &c.* I answer, 1. for the kindes of offices them selves, that were authorized of God before Christ, it was * vnlawfull to institute them heretofore without special allowance from God: but now by consent of common wealths it is lawfull to ordaine their forme of civil governement, and to make new offices, being but the [x] *creations of men*, for the forme of them. 2. For the causes of executing iudgement, Christ hath changed many of them, he hath taken from Magistrates the [y] power of permitting divorces & polygamie, according to the iudicialles of Moses: he hath given [z] power vnto the Magistrates to permit the mariage of beleevers and vnbeleevers without divorce contrary vnto the policy of Moses: he hath also taken from the Magistrate the power of executing the Iudici..ll

* Exod. 18 23. 24. Numb. 11 16. 17. 1. Sam 8. 6. 7 22.
x 1. Pet. 2. 13.
y Mat. 5. 31 32. and 19. 8. 9.
z 1. Cor. 7. 12. &c.

diciall lawes against the transgressers of ceremoniall ordinances, as was shewed before. 3, as for the maner of judgements and punishments themselves to be inflicted on evil doers, even by your owne confession before noted, the Magistrates now are not tyed vnto the Iudiciall law of Moses. 4, even for the time before Christ, the Iewes themselves were not absolutely bound vnto the Iudiciall law of Moses, save in their owne land, where-
a Ester 10. 3. & 8 2. vnto God had apropriated those lawes: for when a *Mordecai*,
b Dan. 2. 48 49. & 6. 2. b *Daniel*, and others were civil Magistrates in *Persia and Babylon*, they could not administer justice according to the policie of Moses, but according to the lawes of those Kingdomes where they lived. If the observation of the Iudiciall lawes of Moses had bene imposed on the Iewes, as strictly as the morall and ceremoniall lawes were, then could not *Mordecai & Daniel* have takē those offices and callings vpon them with good cōscience: so that hereby it may appeare that there is great difference betwixt these lawes, especially in these times. 5, yea even in the holy land it self, when as the Iudiciall lawes of the c *Persians*
c Neh. 10. 37. & d *Romanes*, were established among the Iewes, who were then subiect vnto these nations and vnto their officers, yet did the
d Luk. 2 1. 4 Ioh. 18. 31 godly Iewes live vnder them and submit vnto their authority, which they could not have done in suffring them selves to be guided by their civil lawes, if the Iudicialls of Moses had bene imposed vpō them by the Lord, as precisely and straitly as were the morall and ceremoniall lawes. 6, it is yet a further presumption, when as you say, that *Christ gave Magistrates no directiō Whom and how to punish, otherwise then he gave With God his Father at Mount Sinai.* For Christ with God his Father gave further di-
e Num. 15 32. 34. rection how toe punish the Sabath-breaker, after that they had
f Deut. 13. 12. &c. & 21. 1. 10. 1. & 25. 9. &c departed from Mount Sinai. And afterwards againe at the repeti iō of the law in the land of Moab, there was further directiō given touching f many particulars which were not described in Exodus and Leviticus at mount Sinai. 7, to conclude though some of Moses judicials be abrogate, yet doth it not follow that Magistrates may judge and punish as they themselves think good

good, &c. as you would inferre against vs: The particular determinations of Christ in the new Testament, abrogating some, & confirming other of the Iudiciall lawes, compared with the generall equity of the decalogue and the policy of Moses together now coincident with the doctrine of Christ, may and ought to be a rule of direction vnto Princes and Magistrates in their judgements.

As for the vse of the words, *policy*, & *rudiments*, which I named one after an other, you make a false collection from thence: though I name both, it followes not that I hold both to be of like extent: neither do I restreyne the policy of Moses vnto his rudiments: but my speech argues that some part of his policy consists in ceremonies and rudiments; such as the abolishing of places defiled with Idolatry in such maner as I have manifested before from *Col.* 2. against your perverting of the same.

After this you labour to prove that *our Temples are a synfull reviving of Iewish rudiments, after they Wer. dead by Christ*: your first allegation is, that *the things appoynted of God for his figurative Worship, might not be imitated by men for any vse, as the law in Exod 30. 32. 33. teacheth vs.* Herevnto I answer, 1. this is a bold presumption, to make the yoke of the legall ceremonies heavyer without warrant: for though the holy oyntment and perfume might not be imitated by men for any vse, doth it follow hence that other things appoynted for the figurative worship were in like manner forbidden? for example, we reade of sundry kindes of meat offrings, and among the rest of some g baked, some fryed, and some made in the caldron, and all for the figurative worship of God: how can you ever prove that these kindes of meates thus prepared, which might fitly serve for the ordinary vse of man, were forbidden to be imitated? 2, suppose that before Christ these kinde of meates had bene forbidden, yet are you far wide to apply such a prohibition vnto our time, and to deny vnto vs such preparations of meate as were then vsed in the figurative worship of God: yourself rather are herein
g Levit. 2. 4. 5. 7. &c.

guilty of *a ſynfull reviviving of Iewiſh rudiments* by impoſing
h Gal. 4. 3. Eph. 2 14. 15. Ro. 7. 1. &c vpon vs the ceremoniall prohibitions and ordinances, which are h dead by Chriſt. Yea you would make our burden heavyer then the Iewes, by laying ſuch a yoke of ceremonies on our neckes, as you can not ſhew that God ever layd vpon them. 3, ſuppoſe, that the oyntments, perfumes, meates and temples appoynted for the figurative worſhip of God in old time, might not be imitated by men *for any vſe* as you ſay, and ſuppoſe that we offended alſo by imitating the forme of the Iewiſh temple, as you would have it: then are you and your people inexcuſably guilty of the ſame ſin with vs, while you vſe theſe our temples for divers vſes; you for your ſtudy: divers of your people for receyving of almes in thē, &c. Thus are you caught and entangled in the ſnare which you layd for vs: for you are to remember that the holy oyntment whereof you ſpeak, was
i Exod. 30. 32. 33. i forbidden vnto men not onely in the worſhip of God (otherwiſe then is there expreſſed,) but for any vſe whatſoever: as yourſelf alſo confeſſe: And therfore that ceremonial precept if it be ſtill in force, according to your vrging of the ſame, doth as well condemne your vſe of theſe temples, as ours.

Secondly, for the countenancing and confirming of your obiection, you content not yourſelf with holy ſcriptures, but you lead vs from *Moſes ben Amran* vnto *Moſes ben Maimon*, from faithfull *Moſes* the ſervant of Chriſt vnto the Infidel *Moſes* a profeſſed adverſary of Chriſt, and out of his ſcripture you tell vs, ſpeaking of holy oyntment, that *the Hebrewes from thence rightly concluded, It is vnlawfull for a man to make an houſe after the patterne of the temple.* I anſwer, 1. The collections of thoſe degenerate Hebrewes are moſt vaine, and as in other things, ſo touching this holy oyntment and patterne of the temple: *R. Solomon* k vpon thoſe words, This *ſhalbe an holy oynting oyle vnto me: throughout your generations*; by a cabaliſticall rule collects that there were *twvelve logs* or meaſures of this oyle: becauſe the numerall letters of *Zeh* the word there vſed for *this* do yeeld the number of *twelve*: And further they note that this anoyn-

k Cōment. on Ex. 30. 31.

anoynting oyle [then made] ſhould *continue vnto the world to come*, according to thoſe words, *throughout your generations*. Touching *Beth-habchirah*, the temple or *houſe elect* for the name of God, their traditions are m that it is not lawfull for men to aſſemble vnto the mountaine of that houſe, ſince the deſolation thereof, having with them either *ſtaffe, ſcrip or ſhooes on their feete, or duſt on their feete, &c.* That in the city Ieruſalem itſelf for the holynes thereof they might not give any place to ſtrangers or ſoiourners therein: that they might not make any houſe of buriall therein, except the burialls of the houſe of *David*, and the buriall of *Huldah* which had bene there from the dayes of the former Prophets; that they might not plant any gardens or orchyards in it; that they might not keep any cockes in it, &c. *R. Saadias* (as is recorded by n *Aben Ezra*) giveth this reaſon why *Bezaleel* of the tribe of *Iudah*, & *Aholiab* of tribe *of Dan* were choſen to make the tabernacle: namely becauſe *Iudah* & *Dan* were compared vnto Lyons whelpes, the o one by Iaakob, the p other by Moſes; & that ſo according to the forme of the Lyon broad before and narrow behinde, the tabernacle was alſo made in that forme: But *Aben Ezra* himſelf contradicts this collection in the ſame place, and ſayth that the breadth of the tabernacle was equal, and that there was no cauſe why *Bezaleel and Aholiab* were called vnto this work, but becauſe there were none like vnto them in Iſrael. And a number of ſuch like collections vaine in themſelves, and contradictory vnto one an other might further be brought, to ſhew how vnworthy a thing it is to allow any voyce vnto theſe Rabbines in the controverſies and queſtions of right among Chriſtians. 2, there is yet more colour and excuſe for the Rabbines in this their errour conſidering their eſtate, then there is for you: for they ſuppoſing that the leviticall and ceremoniall ordinances are ſtill in force do more colourably hold that the holy things of God may not be applyed vnto or imitated in common vſe, but you knowing the ceremonies to be aboliſhed, have leſſe reaſon ſo to vvrite as you have done.

m R. Moſes mikkotſ. Sepher mitſvoth haggadol precept. affir. 164. Thalmud Ieruſa. cap. haroeh.

n cōmēt. on Exo. 31. 1.

o Gen. 49. 9

p Deut. 33. 22.

3. The teſtimony of the Rabbines in this matter doth not ſerve to condemne our temples in reſpect of the forme thereof; for as they q write concerning the holy anoynting oyle, the compoſition made like vnto it was then vnlawfull, when it conſiſted both in number and quantity of the ſame kinde of ſpices, but if there were more or leſſe in the compoſition it was lawfull: ſo in like manner if our temples differ both in many parts, and in the proportion and meaſure of them from Solomons Temple, by the ſame reaſon they are to be held lawful. 4. If our Temples be vnlawfull becauſe they are made after the patterne of the Iewiſh Temple, then doth this concluſion of the Rabbines as wel condemne you in the vſe of theſe Temples as it doth vs, for that which you ſay the Hebrues have rightly concluded is ſpoken of any private civill houſes whatſoever made for civil vſe, ſuch they hold to be vnlawfull for any vſe being made after the forme of the Temple: And ſo al that you have ſayd both from the Scripture & from *Maimony* is againſt your ſelf, conſidering the divers vſes which you have of theſe Tẽples, as I ſhewed before.

q R. Solomon & Aben Ezra cõment. on Exo. 30. 32

In the third place, whereas you do alledge the teſtimony of *Bellarmine* to ſhew that *theſe our Temples are purpoſely made after the forme of the Iewes Temple, &c.* I anſwer, 1. you do vnfaithfully alledge the writings of *Bellarmine*, which are directly contrary vnto that which you pretend and give forth in his name: for though he ſhew that ſome Temples in ſome part were like vnto Solomõs Temples, yet he r ſhewes, that whereas the holieſt place in the Temple of Solomon was built towards the weſt, that ours on the quite contrary were built looking towards the eaſt, and this purpoſely to ſignify and teſtify a difference & oppoſition vnto the Iewes: Though this was done for a myſtery alſo as ſome other obſerve, and you note before, that hinders not this purpoſe of being oppoſite vnto the Iewes, but may ſtand with the ſame. 2. As for our temple in ſpeciall about which our queſtion is, it is in no reſpect that you can alledge like vnto Solomons: & therfore no Iewiſh rudiment to cauſe any ſeparation from vs in that regard.

r Bellarm. de cultu ſanct. lib. 3. c. 3. ſec. vlt

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

The ſixt argument concerning Temples, examined. Section. 1.

OVr 6t. reaſon hath 2. branches, I. *That by the deſtruction of Idolies, men are more eaſily drawen to Gods true Worſhip, &c.* Hen. Ainſ.
II. *By reteining them, they are nouriſhed in ſuperſtition, &c.*
Gen. 35. 2. King. 18. 2. Chron. 34. Act. 17. & 19. Lev. 13. & 14. with Iude 23.

You anſwer; That which belonged to the temporary diſpenſation under Moſes being ſet apart; the generall equitie of theſe ſcriptures leads us no further, then to aboliſh ſuch moniments of ſuperſtition and corruption as have no neceſsary uſe.

Repl. *To your exception about Moſes temporarie diſpenſation, I have ſpoken before. This which you now adde, of no neceſsarie vſe, may in ſome ſenſe be granted: for in deed Chriſtians haue no neceſsary vſe of Antichriſts idols or idol Temples, let them therfore periſh with him;* , *as they ſhal,* a *in the time of their viſitation. But if by* Neceſſarie, *you mean in reſpect of humane pleaſure or profit, as the Lutherans may think they have a neceſsary vſe of popiſh images (which they keep in their Churches) either to adorne their Temples, (which may alſo be pleaded for by Pſal. 24. 1. 1. Cor. 10. 26. ſeing we may vſe of the plẽty of the earth euen for ornament alſo) or to remember the ſaints deceaſed, though they worſhip them not: or, as others think they haue a neceſsary vſe of idol Temples, becauſe they would ſpare their purſes, and be at no charge to build other convenient places to worſhip God in: this I iudge to be but a carnal reaſon, and that it ſavoureth not of Gods ſpirit, which throughout the Scriptures condemneth Idols and Idoleies, in reſpect of their* b *abomination before God, and ſnare that they are vnto men. And if this your exception ſhould take place, we ſhould haue very few idols deſtroyed. For they that are popiſhly affected, wil finde ſome neceſſarie vſe for euery idol, to maintcine their ſuperſtition. The gentrie &c.*

a Ier. 10. 15 Rev. 18.

b Exo. 34. 12. 13. 14. 15. Deut. 7. 25 26. Ezek. 23. 14. 16.

may

may weare the popes hallowed golden crucifixes and other sacred Iewels for broches on their hatts, & tablets about their necks, and his beads, for ornaments about their hands. The images of their Ladie, and other gods & goddesses, they may vse to bewtify their houses, yea to adorne the wals and corners of their Churches, as they stil continew in the Church windowes. The altar may be vsed for a communion table, the hallowed font, for a vessel to baptise in, as is vsual in Engl. though these reformed Churches haue doen it away. The Bishops think they haue as necessary vse of their copes & other hallowed vestiments, as you of your Temples, which many of them by reason of their bignes and forme, are fitter a great deale to sing a masse in, then to preach the gospel. So it wil come to passe, that all the popes abominations shalbe reteined for some vse or other, and idolatrie nourished to the dishonour of God. If we should expound all the other commandments, as you interpret this concerning idolatrie: God might iustly condemne us as corrupters of his Law, and seducers of the people. But let us weigh your perticular exceptions.

Answer.

Yo. Pa. FIrst, whereas by way of affirmation, you reply; *in deed Christians haue no necessary vse of Antichrists Idols or Idoltemples*: I answer, 1. If *no necessary vse*: then is your vse of them for study therein and for other purposes, the more cōdemnable, being idle and vnnecessary. 2. These temples haue some necessary vse, because by reteyning of them, that cost and charges which should be employed in the building of others in their stead, may serve to supply the wāts of many godly poore: Such workes and considerations the holy Ghost judgeth to be *necessary vses*. 1 Tit. 3.14.

Secondly, whereas by way of imprecation & cursing, you pray against our temples, wishing for the destruction of Antichrist, & of them together, saying, *let them therfore perish with him*. I answer, 1. you do herein worse then *Balaam*, who was faine to say, t *How shall I curse, where God hath not cursed*? for the law of ceremonies being remooved, you can not shew by any warrant of Scripture that God doth curse the places formerly abused vnto Idolatry, whē as the Idolatrous vse thereof is taken away: we see on the contrary by experience, and you might see that God blesseth our vse of such Temples in all the Reformed Churches, even with that u *abundance of the blessing of the Gospell of Christ*, which is there administred; And therfore we may truely say vnto the Lord concerning your curse, w *though they curse, yet thou wilt blesse*. 2. Do you not see how you curse yourself in praying for the destruction of these Temples, which you and your people frequent so often for divers purposes? For what if God should heare your prayer, and while your self are sitting at your study in one of these Temples, should suddenly rayse a tempest and overthrow the temple? should not your blood be now vpon your owne head that had called for this iudgement? dare you enter into and continue in such a place, against which you pray dayly that God would destroy it? or are you content to perish your self, so that one of these Temples might perish with you? t Num. 23. 8. u Rom. 15. 29. w Ps. 109. 28.

Thirdly, whereas by way of prophecy or prognosticatiō, you foretell the perishing of these Temples, & say; *as they shall, in the time of their visitation*. I answer, 1. that place *Ier.* 10. 15. which you alledge for confirmation of your prophecy, speaketh not of Temples but of Idols, and therfore concludeth nothing against the place vsed by vs. 2. If the destruction of the Babylonish and heathnish Temples had bene there prophecyed of and foretold, as is in other places the destruction even of the private houses of the Babylonians; yet doth not this shew that the like event shalbe vnto all places where Antichristian Idolatry hath bene practised: for both in respect of equitie, there is great difference betwixt Babylonish Temples not purged from their Idolatrous vse; and our Temples that are converted to the lawfull worship of the true God; and againe in respect of the fact, suppose our Temples were as vncleane as the Babylonians, yet is not God bound to deale with all sins alike in this world by executing the same iudgements here vpon all things that are defiled.

filed. There is indeed a time of viſitation when × heaven and earth ſhall periſh; and then our temples are like to periſh alſo; but this periſhing ſhewes them to be no more vnlawfull, then other creatures of God which are ſubiect to vanitie in like maner. 3. As for *Rev.* 18. which chapter you alſo alledge at large for proofe of your prediction in the ruine of our temples; why did you not nominate the verſe and deſcribe your collection from thence, that we might have conſidered the truth and evidence thereof? 4. Do not you remember, how one of your owne fellowſhip and ſociety hath of late time prophecyed and foretold an univerſall maſſacre to come vpon Chriſtendome; & how he is deceyved, the time being paſt which he had nominated and limited for this event? Let his example warne you to take heed of being ſo raſh in prophecying an vniuerſal maſſacre of our temples.

× Pſ. 102. 26. Mat. 5. 18.

Fourthly, you ſay *if by* Neceſſarie, *I meane in reſpect of humane pleaſure or proffit: as the Lutheranes may thinke they have a neceſſary vſe of images, which they keep in their Churches, &c. this you judge to be but a carnall reaſon and not to ſavour of Gods ſpirit, &c.* Herevnto I anſwer, that by neceſſary vſe, I do not meane ſuch as you ſpeak of in the Lutheranes: but I meane (that which it ſeemes you call ſparing of the purſe) ſuch vſe as ſerves to ſupply the neceſſities of the faithfull, and to ſupport the burden of ſuch as are oppreſſed with poverty and want, whiles the church is not charged with the coſt and labour of ſuch buildings: and with all I meane ſuch a circumſtance of place as is in generall of neceſſary vſe for the aſſembling of people, in as much as the worſhip of God by his people can not be performed conveniently without ſuch helpes of a building. And that this regard of neceſſary vſe is not a carnall reaſon, but ſavouring of Gods ſpirit: it may appeare both by the equity of Gods law even in the old Teſtament when as he would have y ceremonies ſome times and in ſome caſes to give place vnto workes of mercy performed for the neceſsities of his people: & much more after the death of Chriſt, when for the proffit of his people, that their outward neceſſities,

y Hoſ. 6. 6. 1. Sam. 21. 4 5. &c. Mat. 12. 1. 7.

neceſſities, wants & poverty might be the better ſuſteyned and releeved, he wholly z took away the burdē of his owne ceremoniall lawes. If God would have his ſtatutes and commandements once given concerning his owne holy place and temple to be changed for the neceſſary vſe and proffit of his people: how much more the ſtatutes once given touching other places and temples abuſed to Idolatry?

z Act. 15. 10. Col. 2. 14.

Fiftly, to prove that the reteyning of our temples in reſpect of *neceſſary vſe* is but a carnall reaſon, you alledge divers ſcriptures, viz *Exo 34. 12. 13. 14. 15. Deut. 7. 25. 26. Ezek. 23. 14. 16, &c* wherin as you ſay, *the ſpirit of God condemneth idols and idoleies, in reſpect of their abomination before God and ſnare that they are vnto men.* I anſwer; that God in his law condemned many things as *an abhomination* vnto himſelf and as *a ſnare* vnto men, which yet are not now of neceſsity to be aboliſhed as in old time: your owne allegations may lead you to ſee the ſame. 1. In Exod. 34. God allowes no compact or covenant with the Idolaters there mentioned: and this commandement of God as appeares by conference with other places of ſcripture was ſo ſtrict that the a covenants of mariage with ſuch perſons vvere to be diſſolved and broken, even after Children borne vnto them in ſuch mariage, that the infidels ſhould not be *a ſnare* vnto the people of God. This law, notwithſtanding the ſnare feared of old, is now changed and more liberty granted vnto Chriſtians, as the b Apoſtle ſhewes: but vnder Moſes the vnbeleeving Idolatrous wife was not ſanctifyed to the beleeving huſband, neither the vnbeleeving heathniſh huſband ſanctifyed to the beleeving Iewiſſe his wife: Pauls plea would not have ſerved in *Ezra* his time, when they put away their ſtrange vvives: A tranſgreſſour might not then juſtly have vſed Pauls vvords for reteyning either huſband or vvife they might not have ſayd; *What knoweſt thou, ô wife, whether thou ſhalt ſave thine huſband? or What knoweſt thou, ô man, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy wife?* Herein therfore vve ſee plainely that for the neceſſitie and benefit of families, God hath changed his lavv, and taken avvay that reſ-

a Ezra. 10. 10. 11. 12. 19. 44. Neh. 13. 3. 23. 30

b 1. Cor. 7. 12. 13. 14. 16.

pect of *a ſnare*, vvhich he ſo ſeverely commanded of old. 2. In *Deut.7.25.26.* God allovves not his people to take the ſilver and gold abuſed vnto Idolatry: not ſo much as to turne it vnto their civil vſe, by taking it to themſelves, or bringing it into their houſes; & this in reſpect of *the ſnare and abomination* you ſpeak of: The tranſgreſſion of this law was the [c] deſtruction of Achan and his familye, and a trouble vnto all Iſrael. But now this law is changed, and the reſpect of the ſnare and the abomination is taken away, as appeareth in the [d] *Idolothytes* now permitted vnto our vſe, which heretofore were vnlawfull, as well as the ſilver and gold mentioned in your allegation. 3, as for that place, *Ezek.23.14.16.* It doth not appeare that the images there ſpoken of were religious images, but rather civill pictures, images of the Babylonians, ſuch as was the [e] image of *Cæſar* in his coyne: And therfore were not vnlawfull even in the time of the law, otherwiſe then by immoderate and inordinate vſe: and ſo even many other lawfull things became [f] *a ſnare and a ruine* vnto men. So that the *ſnare* condemned in your allegations is ſuch, as that the ſtrength and ſtaine thereof depended either vpon a ceremoniall commandement from vvhich vve are freed; or vpon an vnlavvfull vſe, which you can not juſtly impute vnto vs in the vſe of our temples.

[c] Ioſh.7. 1. &c.

[d] 1.Cor.10 27.

[e] Mat. 22. 20.

[f] Pſ.69.22.

Sixtly, vvhereas you ſay, that *if this my exception ſhould take place, we ſhould have very few idols deſtroyed, for they that are Popiſhly affected, will finde ſome neceſſary vſe for every Idol, to maintcine their ſuperſtition. The gentrie may weare the popes hallowed golden crucifixes, and other ſacred Iewels, for broches in their hatts, &c.* Herevnto I anſwer, 1. You ought to put difference betvvixt Idols themſelves, and the places vvhere they have bene vvorſhipped, as the [g] marginall note on Barow acknovvledgeth: Theſe you do vniuſtly confound togather at every turne in your reaſoning; ſeing more deteſtation is to be ſhevved againſt the Idols, then againſt their houſes. 2, As for Popiſh Idols, hallowed crucifixes, their ladies images, and ſuch like things converted vnto ornaments of temples and of the gentry; they

[g] Diſcov. p.133.

they are not things of neceſſary vſe in either of thoſe reſpects that I noted before: they are neither neceſſary circumſtances in the worſhip of God; neither doth this kinde of reteyning them help to ſupply the neceſsities of the faithfull: for if theſe golden implements vvere broken quite in peeces and molten againe, the poore and other faithfull men might then aftervvard have as much and more benefit and neceſſary vſe of them then before; but vvith our temples it is quite contrary in both reſpects. 3, though vve may vſe the plenty of the earth even for ornamẽt alſo, as you alledge before frõ *Pſ.24.1.1 Cor. 10. 26.* yet as the Apoſtle ſhevves in the ſame place, vve may alſo better forbeare the vſe of ſuch things whereof vve enioy a plenty; then of other things vvhereof we ſtand in great neceſſitie. As frõ this that the earth is the Lords, the Apoſtle [h] proves vve may have a lavvfull vſe of ech creature therein: ſo from the fulnes, plenty and variety of creatures, he ſhevves that in ſome caſes vve ſhould forbeare the vſe of one rather then an other: and of vvhat rather then of ſuch vaine, and vnneceſſary ornaments, as you ſpeak of? 4. As for copes and other hallowed veſtments, there is alſo a manifeſt difference betvvixt them and our temples: for vvhatſoever others may think, that ſkilles not; while we ſee that an houſe is of neceſſary vſe in the ſervice of God, & that the ſurplice is but a ſurplus, a ſuperfluous thing of no neceſſary vſe: And hereby you may plainely diſcerne the difference; becauſe not onely that very ſame ſurplice which Papiſts vſed and defiled with their vſe, is vnlawfull: but any other ſurplice newly made for a miniſteriall garment, yea though the forme in ſome part be altered, though it be not conſecrated as the [i] Popiſh veſtments were, yet being of no neceſſary vſe in the ſervice of God, is ſtill vnlawfull: neither do I think that you would willingly weare ſuch an albe: but I hope you vvill not ſay ſo of all temples new made, as of the *Zuyder Kerck* in this city: And yet if you will argue againſt our temples as againſt a ſurplice: then are we to have no temple at all, but to meet *ſub dio* vnder the welkin; becauſe vve are to have no ſurplice at all. If in

[h] 1.Cor.10 26. with verſ.28.

[i] Pontifical. par.2 de benedictione ſacerdotal. indum.

your annotations on the holy scriptures you should expound the other commandements of God on this manner, you would yet prove a greater corrupter of his law and seducer of his people.

Section. 2.

" *AGainst the example of Iakobs practise in Gen. 35. 2. (which was before Moses policie) you obiect, how many private houses should then be rased : seing they have been polluted with idolatrie, and been nurseries of superstition, as well as their publik high places, Ios. 24. 23. Iudg. 17 4. Zeph. 1. 5. with Deut. 27. 15.*

I answer; first you change the state of the question, which is of Idols and idolies: and not of houses or other things polluted with idolatrie. Secondly, there is no law of God to destroy such civil houses, as there is to destroy idolies: (and where there is no Law, there is a no transgression:) *but on the contrary, God gave Israel the Canaanites* b *Cities and howses to dwell in, when he* c *commanded their idolies to be demolished. Thirdly, you have no reason to compare civil houses polluted with idolatrie, with idols or idolies: seing even Gods own house was polluted with idolatrie, & yet was not counted an idolie, or destroyed, but* d *cleansed: neyther can it without impietie, be matched with the high places of idols, or counted a nurserie of superstition, as wel as they. Neither are any civil dwelling houses, though idols have been worshiped in them, such moniments of idolatrie, or nurseries of superstition, as the temples of heathens or of Antichristians; which are merely and properly idolies yea very idols, as before I have manifested from the Pontifical. And this we may learne of the heathen* e Demetrius, *who complained how by the Apostles preaching, the temple of the great goddesse* Diana *should be despised, and her Majestie should be destroyed: which he would never have spoken of the dwelling houses of Ephesus, though her worshipers kept in them. The Papists also will tell you, that the very* f *walles of their Churches dedicated vnto God, doe* move vnto pietie, *as doe the Altars, crosses, images, &c. which* incitements to devotion are not found otherwhere,

a Rom. 4. 15.
b Deut. 6. 10 11.
c Deut. 12. 2. 3.
d 2. King. 23 4. 6. 11. 12.
e Act. 19. 27
f Bellarm. de cult. sanct. lib. 3. c. 4.

where. *That God is after* g *a peculiar manner in the temple, and heareth mens prayers sooner there, by promise. That the temple is dedicated to sacred actions, and is not a profane house but an holy: and* h *to signify that, it is anoynted with oile. That the Divil* i *is cast out of it and not suffred there to dwell, therfore the dore is knocked on, and the Divill is bidden goe away. So that there is no comparison between these consecrate places, and the common houses of men: and let our very enemies be the judges. Fourthly, the Hebrew doctors who are most precise in condemning outward moniments of idolatrie, and hold even a ceremoniall pollution by the very touching of an idol; yet say of such civil houses wherin Idols are set vp, that when the* k the Idol is taken out, the house is lawfull. *And these things serve for answer to the scriptures by you cited; and to the houses of the Mussovites and Papists, and the houses wherin we our selves meet, which you obiect vnto vs, and doe vntruly call one of them, the* Iewes Idol-temple.

g Ibidem.
h Ibid. c. 5.
i Ibidem.
k Maimony treat. of Idolatrie c. 8 s. 4.

Answer.

VVHen you argued that our temples were to be destroyed because they serve to nourish superstition, I shewed the weaknes of this argument, because of the inconvenience that would follow; namely, that thē many private houses which both of ancienter and later times have bene defiled with Idols, should likewise be destroyed, being nurseries of superstition as well as other publike places: Touching this *first*, you say, I *change the state of the question which is of Idols and Idolies, & not of houses or other things polluted with Idolatrie.* I answer, 1. either you do not mark my reason, or els you do not vnderstand the lawes of right reasoning: for that which I sayde of the lawfull reteyning of private houses was not to rest therein, as in a conclusion of the question; but the mention thereof served onely as a *medius terminus* or as an argument to infer the conclusion, as if I had vsed this Syllogisme:

If all nurseries of superstitiō are to be vtterly destroyed, then

are

are private houſes alſo to be deſtroyed for nouriſhing of ſuperſtition.

But private houſes are not to be deſtroyed for their nouriſhing of ſuperſtition.

Therfore, al nurſeries of ſuperſtition are not to be deſtroyed. From hence you might have diſcerned the force of your reaſon, drawne from the nouriſhing of ſuperſtition, refuted. 2. If this kinde of reaſoning in me may not be admitted, then may I in like maner tel you when you ſeek to infer inconveniencies vpō me, by the cope, mitre, ſurplice, & ſuch like things; that you change the ſtate of the queſtion betwixt vs, vvhich is not about veſtments and ſurplices, but about places and temples abuſed vnto Idolatry. 3. It is yourſelf vvho indeed ſeek to chang the ſtate of the queſtion, in that you ſay, our queſtion is *of Idols*, which it is not, but onely of Idolies, or places abuſed vnto Idolatry, as may appeare by the queſtions propounded in my
k Fol. 2. a. k firſt writings, accepted of by you: neither have you proved our Temples to be Idols, that ſo by that meanes you might bring in Idols within the compaſſe of the queſtion. 4. You do here contradict your ſelf, when you ſay, the queſtion is *of Idolies, and not of houſes or other things polluted with Idolatrie:* For, I pray you, what is an Idolie, but an houſe or place polluted with Idolatrie? As publique houſes polluted with Idols, are publique Idolies; ſo are private houſes polluted with Idolatrie, private Idolies: And therfore both in the Syriaque and Arabique tranſlations of 1. *Cor. 8. 10.* in ſtead of *Idolie*, they have *the houſe of Idols:* and in
l Iudg. 17. 4. 5. other places of Scripture, theſe Idolies are called l *houſes of Idols, and houſes of Gods.*

Secondly, you ſay, *there is no law of God to deſtroy ſuch civill houſes, as there is to deſtroy idolies, &c.* I anſwer: ſeing God gave vnto Iſrael the cities and houſes of the Canaanites to dwell in, when as he commanded the publique places of their Idolatry to be demoliſhed, as you confeſſe: this confirmes that which I ſayd, and ſhewes that the commandement of deſtroying publique idolies did not depend merely vpon the nouriſhing of Idolatry

Idolatry, for then the private idolies ſhould have bene deſtroyed alſo for their nouriſhing of Idolatry: becauſe the like ſins deſerve and call for the like judgement. And this appeares yet further from your owne allegation compared with other ſcriptures: for vvhereas in *Deut. 6. 10. 11.* God allowes Iſrael to dwell in the cities and houſes of the Canaanites, to enioy their welles, their vineyards and olive trees; yet at an other time according to the pleaſure of his owne will, he m commands the cities and houſes of Idolatrous Moabites to be deſtroyed; every faire tree to be felled; all their fountaines of water to be ſtopt; and every good field to be marred with ſtones; to ſhew his deteſtation of their ſin, which yet he would not have to be ſhewed againſt the Canaanites by the ſame meanes, although the ſnare and danger of being nouriſhed in Idolatry and other ſin, was greater and more to be feared from the Canaanites then from the Moabites. If God tooke ſuch a different courſe with Idolatours and nouriſhers of ſuperſtition vnder the law; it ought not to ſeeme ſtrange vnto vs that he declares his deſtation of Idolatry now vnder the Goſpell by other meanes and maner then vnder the law, according to the counſell of his owne will. m 2. Kin. 3. 19. 25.

In the third place, you ſay, I have *no reaſon to compare civill houſes polluted with Idolatry, with Idols or Idolies: ſeing even Gods owne houſe was polluted with idolatrie, and yet was not counted an Idolie, or deſtroyed, &c.* I anſwer, 1. Suppoſe I had no reaſon to compare civill houſes with Idolies as you ſay; yet your reaſon from Gods houſe doth not warrant you ſo to ſay: for the tēple of God having many priviledges which civil houſes had not, might be exempted from the judgement of preſent deſtructiō more then they: & therfore your plea is inſufficient. 2, though Gods owne houſe, when it was polluted with Idolatry, vvas not to be deſtroyed, but cleanſed as *2. Kin. 23.* yet have you no warrant to ſay, that *It was not counted an Idolie*: but as it vvas ſometimes denominate of other ſins, and called n a *Denne of Theeves*, vvhen ſuch vvickednes vvas maintayned: ſo vvhat n Ier. 7. 11. mat. 21. 13

hinders but that it might likevvise be called a Denne of Idolaters, or an Idolie, during the time that it vvas full of Idols and not cleanſed from Idolatrie? 3, it is alſo falſe vvhich you ſay of the temple, that *it cannot without impietie be matched with the high places, or counted a nurſery of ſuperſtition as well as they.* For when as the temple, through the abhominable Idolatries
o 2.Kin. 21 4.5 &c. Ier 2. 10.11 & 3 11. Ezek 16. 46.47. 51. 52 37. & 23.11.39. 40.&c.
o practiſed in it was become an vncleane ſtewes of ſpirituall whoredome, above many of the Idol-places, being alſo more famous for the place and perſons polluting it and emiſſing vnto Idolatry, exceeding Sodom and Samaria in their heathniſh Idolatries: did not this notorious ſcandall given in the temple of God nouriſh ſuperſtition ten times more then the Idolatries committed in ſome obſcure Idol temples of the heathen? And though God gave no law for deſtroying of this his temple when it became a nurſery of ſuperſtition, yet this hinders not but that it did ſometimes match and overmatch the high places of the heathens in nouriſhing of Idolatry. The vvill of God vvas that ſome Idolies ſhould be deſtroyed & ſome not. 4, for *civil dwelling houſes* where Idols have bene worſhiped, though they be not *ſuch* moniments and nurſeries of ſuperſtition, as ſome other publique Idolies, that impeacheth not my aſſertion: it is enough for me, that they have in ſome meaſure bene nurſeries of ſuperſtition: Even among the publique Idolies themſelves, ſome temples of Antichriſt are not *ſuch* nurſeries of ſuperſtition as ſome other be, which are ten times more devoutly obſerved and waited on, then the reſt. 5, how know you that that all the temples of the heathens had no civill dwellings in any part of them, & that they were (as you ſay) *merely Idolies?* how know you but that ſome of them might be inhabited, in ſuch maner as your Idolie is, reſerving the principall place for their Idol-ſervice and devotion? your making of them mere Idolies in this ſenſe, ſeemes to be a mere preſumption and affirmation without proofe. 6, I may rather ſay on the contrary, that they were not merely Idolies becauſe ſome part of them were put to civill vſes as one of your owne Au-

p Authors teſtifyeth for the Idolie that *Geroldus* deſtroyed: there being *a meeting in the court thereof every munday for judgements by the King and the flamine:* It is alſo noted of divers temples of Antichriſt, that q *civil judgements*, and other civil buſineſſes were wont to be performed there: And that our temples are often put vnto divers civil vſes alſo, dayly experience witneſſeth. That which you ſay of manifeſting them to be *very Idols*, out of the Pontifical is already anſwered. 7. vve cannot ſay but that ſome private Idolies, and civil dwelling houſes, were equal in nouriſhing of ſuperſtition even vnto ſome publique Idolies: when as r Altars vvere made vpon the houſe tops, eſpecially vpon Kings or Princes houſes as vpon *Ahaz* his chamber: The reſort vnto ſuch places and the ſcandall by the Idol-worſhip there performed might nouriſh ſuperſtition more then the devotion performed in ſome other obſcure Idolies and groves of the heathens. 8, How frivolous is that which you write of the heathen *Demetrius*? how know you that *he would never have ſpoken of the dwelling houſes in Epheſus* as he did of Dianaes temple, concerning her maieſtie? ſeing that which he ſpoke was for his ſgaine: and ſeing his gaine conſiſted in ſelling litle temples of Diana: it was ſutable and fit for his purpoſe that men ſhould think their private dwelling houſes would be more holy if they had thoſe litle temples or ſhrines of *Diana* in them, and therfore who can ſay but that he would vpon occaſion complaine that the maieſtie of *Diana* and of her great temple would be deſpiſed, if men did not ſhew their devotion in buying thoſe litle temples for the hallowing of their houſes and for the maintenance of her worſhip? And what if he would not ſo have complained? yet might their houſes in Epheſus have bene Idolies, in reſpect of their *lares familiares*, and other houſhold Gods privately worſhipped by them. 9. Vnto that which you alledge out of *Bellarmine* touching the Popiſh opinion of holynes in their temples, I anſwer that they will alſo tell you the like touching their private dwelling houſes, when as they are conſecrated alſo according

p Cranz. VVandal. li.4.c.23.
q Magdeb. centur.12. col.870. 871.
r Zeph.1.5 2.Kin.23. 12.
Act.19. 4.25.

to their maner: namely, that the vvalles of their houſes being hallowed with the ſigne of the croſſe and holy vvater are more holy then other houſes not bleſſed after that maner; that God is then after a peculiar maner preſent in ſuch houſes more thē in other houſes; that the divell is driven avvay and expelled: for ſuch vertue and efficacie of t driving avvay evill ſpirits, of communicating holynes, and ſtirring vp devotion they do every vvhere aſcribe vnto the ſigne of the croſſe: Their common ſaying is: u *per crucis ſignum fugiat hinc omne malignum, &c* Having therfore that Idolatrous ſigne over the dores of their dvvelling houſes vvithout; and on the vvalles vvithin, what holynes and vertue can be vvanting vnto them? And therfore though our enimies are not to be admitted for Iudges; except it be againſt themſelves as Moſes w alledgeth them: yet in this matter their teſtimony is againſt you.

t Bellarm. de imagin. ſanc. lib. 2. cap. 29. Pontifical u Catechiſ. Regin. Mariæ, Angl.

vv Deut. 32 31.

Fourthly, you plead from the Hebrevv doctours: & tel vs out of *Maimony*, what is ſayd *concerning civil houſes*, namely that, *When the Idol is taken out, the houſe is lawfull:* Herevnto I anſvver: 1. The teſtimony & authority of *Maimony* is of no vveight nor worth: think you that I feare the arme of *Rambam*, that you come ſo oft in his name againſt me? vvhat meane you to tell vs ſo often of hebrew doctours and Ievve doctours, vvhich are indeed neither Iewes nor doctours; but ſuch as the holy Ghoſt ſpeakes of, x *Which ſay they are Iewes and are not, but are the Synagogue of Satan:* y *They would be doctours of the law and yet vnderſtand not what they ſpeak: They are* z *Doters about queſtions: puft vp and know nothing*: a *Separate thy ſelf from ſuch:* But you that ſeparate your ſelf from all the miniſters of Chriſte, and in al this writing have not alledged one of the lights of the reformed Churches, do yet at every turne cal for Iewiſh, popiſh, heathniſh writers to ſpeak for you. You tell vs *they are moſt preciſe in condemning outward moniments of Idolatry &c.* But it is hard to ſay vvhether their preciſenes be more impious or abſurd; impious, in condemning the vvorſhip of God in Chriſt Ieſus to be Idolatry; abſurd, in avoyding even the b civill inſtruments and veſſels and meate of

x Rev. 2. 9.
y 1 Tim. 1. 7
z 1. Tim. 6. 4.
a Ibid. vſ. 5

b Arba Turim, in lib. jore-dea. tract. cele haiajin. ſigno. 135. & tract. Pittim, ſign. 112.

of Chriſtians, as the pollutions of Idolatry: and this yet vvith great contradiction among themſelves. Their preciſenes is much like to that of the Iewes in the Goſpell, vvhich c *vvould not go into the common hall leſt they ſhould be defiled:* and yet in the meane time imbrued thēſelves in the blood of Chriſt: And evē in the place alledged how vaine are the traditiōs which *Maimony* teacheth, touching *the body of the Idolatrous oke or other tree, being lawful for vſe but onely the Boughes, brāches & fruites vnlawful:* with divers ſuch like. 2, you do alſo corrupt the teſtimony of *Maimony* in this place; for he ſpeakes not of *civil houſes* onely as you would make him to ſpeak by your application of his words: his ſpeech may be vnderſtood of other houſes alſo, as of Synagogues built for the worſhip and ſervice of God: Neither is there any thing in that Chapter that ſhould reſtrayne his indefinite ſpeech of a houſe vnto civil houſes: and therfore your owne Author is even in this teſtimony here produced by you, contradictory vnto yourſelf, who in an other e place do teach that though our Churches have not bene built by Antichriſt, though the Idols be alſo taken out of them, that yet they are to be deſtroyed: being herein more vnreaſonable then your preciſe and impious *Maimony*. 3. Suppoſe that *Maimony* here ſpake of civil houſes as being lawfull for vſe when the Idol is taken away, then doth he in this poynt agree with me who hold the ſame; and vvrote ſo much before, viz. that f God never commanded, nor the godly ever practiſed ſuch a demoliſhing of private houſes: but he is here againſt you vvho would have the houſes which have bene nurſeries of Idolatry to be deſtroyed; and conſequently the houſes of the Moſchovites, Papiſts and even of your ovvne Idolies alſo, of vvhich more hereafter in their proper place.

c Ioh. 18. 28

d Maimony in Abod. Zarah. c. 8.

e Counterpoy p 199.

f pag. 23.

Section. 3.

Hem. Anſ. *AGainſt the example of the brazen ſerpent deſtroyed, 2. King. 18. 4 You ſay, it was of no neceſſary vſe, and therfore might well be deſtroyed. I anſwer, there was as neceſſary vſe of it ſtil, as there had been before: and therfore in that reſpect, no more cauſe to deſtroy it now, then in former times. Yea it being a moniment of Gods ancient*

a Ioh. 3. 14. *mercie to his Church, and a figure a of future grace: they might have pretended a much more neceſſary and profitable vſe to reſerve it, then you can for reſerving the idolies of the Pope. But the ſcripture it ſelf*

b 2. King. 18. 4. *ſheweth an other cauſe then you allege, namely for that the Iſraelits b did burne incenſe vnto it, and not for that there was no neceſſary vſe therof. And the ſame cauſe (beſides other) lyeth againſt your idol temples: for to this day, many people burne incenſe vnto them, eſteming and uſing them as ſanctified places for the incenſe of their prayers, and other religious works. If you require a proof you may ſee it in this citie, if not at other times, at leaſt on Sacraments day, ſo called: When above other dayes, the papiſts viſit their anciet Temple ſolemnly, ſome of them barefooted: & if the dores be ſhut that they cannot goe in, yet they doe their devotion in proceſſion about the idolie. And wherfore may we think, have the* Nunnes *a key of your chappel (as is reported) but for to doe honour to their* Dianaes ſhrine: *it is for no devotion to your worſhip therin, you may be ſure, but rather that they may continue* Temple keepers *(or worſhipers) of their former gods, as the Ephe-*

c Act. 19. 35 *ſians c were of their Diana. If you plead, that theſe burne not incenſe to the Temples, but to God in them: the ſame I anſwer for the Iſraelits, that they alſo burnt incenſe to God, before the braſen ſerpent, for they were not ſo ſottiſh as to worſhip a peece of Braſſe. But the ſcripture vſeth to call the worſhiping of God, by or before an idol, the worſhiping of the idol it ſelf: as in Act. 7. 41. they are ſayd to offer ſacrifice vnto the idol, whereas in Exod. 32. it appeareth they ſacrificed to the Lord, the God that had brought them out of Egypt. So they that worſhiped*

d 2. Chron. 24. 18. *in the idolatrous groves, are ſayd to* d*ſerve the groves: and ſundry the like.*

Anſwer.

Anſwer.

VNto my anſvver touching the brazen ſerpent, your reply Ioh. Pag. is: *there was as neceſſary vſe of it ſtill, as there had bene before, &c.* I anſvver; And therfore I graunt alſo, if in former times it had bene abuſed vnto Idolatry, in the time of the Iudges or of former Kings, there had bene cauſe to have aboliſhed the ſame, vvhile there vvas no neceſſary vſe thereof: And vvhat doth this help you?

Secondly, vvhereas you proceed and adde that *it being a moniment of Gods ancient mercy and figure of future grace, they might have pretended a much more neceſſary vſe, &c.* I anſwer further, though it had bene a holy ſigne and type as *Ioh. 3. 14.* yet this proves not ſo proffitable a vſe thereof as we have of our temples: The g bunch of Hyſſop where with they ſprinckled their g Exo. 12. houſes at the paſſeover, was a monimēt of Gods ancient mercy 22. and a type h of future grace, yet after the ſacred action of ſprin- h Pſ. 51. 7. kling ceaſſed, there was no ſuch neceſſary vſe either of it or of 1. Pet. 1. 2. the brazen ſerpent, being now no neceſſary circumſtances in the ſervice of God, as a place or houſe to meet in ſtill is, and the poore not able to receyve any ſuch benefit by reteyning the hyſſop or the ſerpent, as now they may by reteyning of theſe temples. As the holy mount after the law was delivered, and the ſound of the Trumper ended became i lawfull for common i Exod. 19. vſe againe and the religious obſervation thereof ceaſſed: ſo 12. 13. was it vvith the brazen ſerpent, and the bunch of hyſſop as touching the holynes thereof: but as for the civil help and benefit we have by theſe temples, the continuance thereof is apparant and manifeſt vnto all.

Thirdly, whereas you ſay that *the ſcripture it ſelf alledgeth an other cauſe, namely for that the Iſraelites burned incenſe vnto it, &c.* You know well enough that I preſuppoſe that cauſe & grant the ſame, according to your allegation, from 2. King. 18. 4. which I my ſelf before noted; and the ſtate of our controverſy which

is

is concerning things abuſed vnto Idolatry, doth alſo manifeſte vnto every one: yet that hinders not but we may alſo conſider this as a concurring cauſe to be ioyned with the former, and this ſo much the rather touching the deſtruction of the braſen ſerpent, becauſe the originall thereof was not for Idol ſervice. Otherwiſe, if without regard of neceſſary vſe each temple abuſed vnto Idolatry muſt be deſtroyed, as the braſen ſerpent was for the abuſe thereof; then not onely the temples built & dedicated by heathens & papiſts but alſo the temples newly built by the proteſtants for the true and lawfull worſhip of God, ſuch as are the Zuyder-Kerck in this city and divers more in other places, (if the the papiſts ſhould get them but one moneth or week into their handes & ſing one maſſe therein) ſhould in like maner be raſed and demoliſhed. But you muſt yet ſtreyne your wit to draw more ſubtile conſequences before you can ſhew vs ſuch temples in the belly of the braſen-ſerpent, which by your arguing you would make to be ſuch a devouring Dragō. In Iſrael beſide the temple were [k] Synagogues built for the ſervice of God: And Hiſtorians record (as your ſelf alſo I acknowledge) that in one city Ieruſalem there were above foure hundred Synagogues [l]. Now by your reaſoning if an Idolatrous king had riſen vp over al Iſrael; & raigned but one moneth as did [m] *Shallum* the ſonne of *Iabeſh* & during that time had converted all their Synagogues vnto the ſervice of Idols, all thoſe Synagogues throughout Iſrael muſt never more have bene employed vnto the ſervice of the true God, but every one of thē plucked downe & deſtroyed: and this ſo often (if others were built againe) as any new pollution ſhould come vpon them, though but for a moneth, or even for one houres abuſing vnto falſe worſhip. This havock your Hammer and argument makes among the houſes of God. As Nebuchadnezzar was once the [n] *Hammer of the world*; ſo if there were ſtrength in your arme and authority according to your minde, we ſhould have you to be the Hāmer of Chriſtendome, not onely to break the conſtitution of their ſpiritual ſocieties every where, but alſo to overturne & raſe their materiall

k Act. 15. 21. Mat. 4. 23.
Pſ. 74. 4. 8.
l Annot. (c) pſ. 74. 4.
m 2. Kin. 15. 13.
n Ier. 50. 23

materiall buildings: No neceſſary vſe would ſerve for any plea or excuſe before ſuch a ſevere judge.

Fourthly, you ſay: *the ſame cauſe lyeth againſt our Idol-temples: for to this day many people burne incenſe vnto them:* and for proofe hereof, you alledge that *in this city if not at other times, at leaſt on Sacraments day, ſo called, we may ſee the papiſts viſit their ancient temple ſolemnely; ſome of them barefooted, &c.* Hereunto I anſwer. 1. This action of the Papiſts whereof you ſpeak is not in any publique ſolemne meeting, as your words might make the reader to imagine, and ſo deceive him thereby: but a thing done by ſtealth of ſome ſuperſtitious perſons, who as I heare do now and then viſit that temple as a holy place: The Magiſtrate of this city doth puniſh the Papiſts even for their ſecret meetings in private houſes: and much leſs will they ſuffer publique and ſolemne aſſemblies for Idol-ſervice. If ſuch a viſitation of temples as this is be a juſt cauſe of deſtroying them, then what temple ſhall be free from deſtruction, if the Papiſts may have liberty at any time to come neer it and to pollute it with their devotions? It is affirmed by many, (and it is agreeable to the Romiſh profeſſion) that the Churchyard and Church lately built in this city, have in the night ſeaſon bene viſited by the Papiſts and conſecrated by their prieſt or Biſhop for the buriall of their dead, which are often buried there: And now by your reaſoning, becauſe the Papiſts have on this manner burned incenſe vnto it, and hallowed it for their vſe, and eſteeme it a ſanctifyed place, it ſhould be deſtroyed as well as the braſen ſerpent was. 2, The ſuperſtitious devotions which by ſome ſtragling people are now and then performed at this temple whereof you ſpeak, were in like maner practiſed by them, (as thoſe that have ſeene do teſtify) even then when it was turned vnto a civill vſe and made a pack houſe for wares: for vnto ſuch vſe it was by the Magiſtrates appoyntment heretofore employed, vntill of later time, the city encreaſing, they found a neceſſary vſe of it for the people to meet in, vnto the ſervice of God. And this being ſo, that the reteyning of this place for

civill vse hath given liberty vnto Papists to burne incense vnto it (as you speak) as vvel as the religious vse thereof: then are you as deep in this sin as others whom you accuse for nourishing superstition: for it hath bene and is the maner of your people to reteyne a civil vse of these hallowed places for the buriall of the dead. Though you have nor power to destroy them, yet ought you to forbeare the vse of these hallowed places, if there be such a sinfull nourishing of superstition thereby. Yea if any difference be, it is the reteyning of these places for civill vse that gives the Papist more liberty and occasion to performe and continue their devotions still, because they think that our vse of their temples in the service of God doth more pollute them, and make them vnfit for their vse then turning of them to pack houses. 3, Suppose that there were offence given in reteyning this particular temple which you mention & which some Papists do more dote vpon, then vpon other places; in respect of some miraculous vertue and holynes which they have imagined and beleeved to be in it through their popish delusions, yet this may not serve to condemne all other in like manner: And least of all can it serve to condemne the place of our worship, about which in particular this our present controversy is. The vvoman that occasioned this dispute & pretended scruple of joyning with our congregation in respect of our temple, need not to be offended at this place of ours, for the superstition that is practised in an other place.

Fiftly, you ask *wherfore the Nunnes have a key of our Chappel (as is reported) but for to do honour to their Dianacs shrine, &c.* I answer: 1. The report which you repeat is a false report and vntrue: The Baguines or vvomen (whom you call Nunnes) have no key vvhereby they may come into our Chappell: neither have had these many yeares; And therfore directly contrary vnto that which the tovvne cleark of Ephesus sayd boasting, & vvhich you o alledge for them; they may take vp a lamentation and say; vvho knovveth not, that vve are no longer templekeepers nor vvorshipers in the Chapell, vvhich is taken from

o Act. 19. 35.

vs: vve have lost possession and have no keyes of entrance, &c. Regard not such sleight reports: if you were vvise you vvould not mention them, vntil you had more vvarrant & assurance of the truth thereof. 2, your self are rather a Sexton or temple-keeper of an Idol-tēple, having obteyned to keep for your vse a key of the library in that temple which you resort vnto & yet would have it to be destroyed and rased: No Nunnes have any such dore in our temple to be opened by them at their pleasure as you have there: But I pray you tell vs, since you would not have these temples once abused by Antichrist to be exempted from ruine and destruction more then the rest: would you be content thus to have kept a key of some cel in Appollos Oracle at Delphos, or of Baal-zebubs tēple in Ekron where you might dayly have heard the divel speaking alowd in his owne person? If so, surely you do thē lesse hate Idol-tēples & devilles houses, then many of those vvhom you do so much accuse thereof.

Sixtly, as for the distinction which you vvould preoccupate viz. of *burning incense not to the temples but to God in them:* though I condemne those that shall make such distinctions to defend their superstition withall: yet whereas you say further, that you *answer the same thing for the Israelites, that they also burnt incense to God, before the brazen serpent, for they were not so sottish as to worship a peece of brasse:* this your saying is vnwarrantable: for the p folly & sottishnes of Idolaters leads thē to as great absurdities as the worshiping of a peece of brasse: p they being so infatuate as to worship the basest creatures: they become not onely q brutish as the beasts, but even r blockish like the senseless stones which they serve: And thē what warrāt have you to limit their folly, as though they could not proceed thus far to worship a peece of brasse: especially considering the s rage of Idolatry that was about this time of *Ahaz* whom Hezekias succeeded and then destroyed the brasen serpent? you are in this poynt more erroneous then the Idolatrous Iesuite himself t who confesseth this sottishnes of Idolaters, which you deny in the Israelites. And what though sometimes *the scripture call the worshiping of God*

p Rom. 1. 22, 23 25. Ezec 8. 10. 11. 14.
q Ier. 10. 14
r Ps. 115. 8
s 2. Kin. 16 3.
t Bellarm. de imagin. lib. 2 c. 11 & 15.

by an Idol, the worshiping of the Idol it self, as you shew from *Exo.* 32 *with Act.* 7. 41? must it needes do so therfore at all times? or must it therfore do so at this place concerning the brasen serpent? The sottishnes of Idolaters in worshiping very wood & stone for their Gods is shewed at large by u our writers who do therfore also justly reprove the slanders of *Bellarmine* who because *Calvine* collected from Exo. 32. that there and in such places the true God was worshiped by an Idol after a false maner, did therfore slander him as though he had sayd the Iewes did worship the true God in all their Idols. But your allegation & application of that place Exo. 32. vnto the question in hand, is as vaine as that which was slanderously imputed vnto *Calvine*. Besides this, there is great difference betwixt worshipping God by or before an Idoll, and the worshipping in or at an Idol-temple; These two are not to be matched togather: As you alledge that men are sayd *to serve the groves*, 2. *Chron.* 24. 18. So by the like figurative speech men are sayd to serve the tabernacle or to do w the service of the tabernacle & of the house of God, because of their attendance vpon the same in their severall charges: yet this is not all one with kneeling downe before a brasen bowle, a flesh hook, or an embroydered Cherub in a curtaine of the tabernacle and worshipping God thereby, as Idolaters vse to do in the Idols: such serving of the tabernacle I think you will not allow: And so on the contrary the service of the groves, being a large and generall speech is to be considered of more distinctly, then you have yet propounded the same vnto vs.

u Ioan. Rainol. cens. Apocr. tom. 2. prælec. 223.

v Num. 18 4. 6 1. Chro. 9 13. & 28, 13. 21.

Section. 4.

Hen. Ainsw. *AGainst the example of* Iosias, *in 2. Chron. 34. you say, those things were also of no necessary vse. I answer, you fall againe into your former fallacie, putting that for the cause which was not. And besides the reasons which I fore-alledged, the text it self she-*

t Vers. 4. *weth otherweise, for he made* t *dust of them. Could not the things have*

have been put to some necessarie vse: and were they therfore turned to dust and powder? The godly zele of the King, compared with Gods law, perswadeth that his own profit or necessary vse, was not the thing that he respected. And what if the high places were not houses meet to be converted into synagogues; yet might they have served for other vses: and the houses of Dagon and Baal, and the temples which Israel builded * *when they forgot their maker, were as fit for synagogues as Antichrists temples now. And if you will regard later examples: you may see many idol houses and moniments destroyed by Christian Princes, and by Bishops having leave from such: and this not because they could not have put them to necessary vses, but for zele and detestation of idolatrie. As* 1 *Constantine the Emperour rased down Venus temple, with all statues and moniments of it: &* 2 *the Python in Cilicia, with his temple.* 3 *Theodosius commanded the temples of idols to be overthrowen.* 4 *Gaudentius & Iovius ruinated such places in the reigne of Honorius.* 5 *Carolus Magnus, when he had conquered Saxonie, did the like to the idolies of Maydenburgh and Mars mount.* 6 *Marcus Bishop of Arethusa, performed the like service in Constantines dayes, and* 7 *Bishop Porphyrie shewed like zele at Gaza, and* 8 *Bishop Abdas did the like among the Persians, vpon their Temples consecrated to the Fyre. John* 9 *Chrysostome sent men to doe the like work in Phœnicia.* 10 *Bishop Geroldus burned to ashes, a grove which the Sclavi had in sacred reverence.* 11 *VVigbertus Bishop of Merseburgh did likewise, and* 12 *Unwannus of Hamburgh, cut down all the idolatrous groves in his diocese.* 13 *In Lituania, the Temples and Altars of idols were demolished: and in sundry other places, as Historiographers doe record. And now of late the Christians in France (as at Rochel) ruinated the popish Temples there: all which doe bear witnes to the true meaning of Gods law, written in their harts, otherwise then in yours, who plead to have such places continued for to worship God in, vpon a pretense of necessary vse.*

* Hos 3. 1.

1 Eusebius de vita Const. l. 3. c. 53. 2 Socrates Hist. l. 1. c. 14. 3 Theodoret hist. l. 5. c. 37. 20. 21. Sozom. l. 7 c. 20. 21 4 Augustin de civ. Dei, l. 18. c. 54. 5 Cranz l. 2 Saxon. c. 9. & 12. 6 Theodor. hist. l. 3. c. 7 7 Sigonius l. 10. Imperij occident 8 Cassiod. lib. 3. Hist. tripart. 9 Theodor. l. 5. 2. 29. 10 Helmoldus in Sclavorũ Chrõ. 11 Chron. Mersburg. Lituania.

l. 2. c. 6. 12 Cranz. in Metrop. l. 4. c. 1. 13 Cromer. l. 15. & Guagninus de

Answer.

Iob. Pag. THe reasons *which you fore alledged* against the consideration of necessary vse in things abused vnto Idolatry, are before answered: vnto that which you now labour to shew out of the text itself I answer further, 1. vvhereas you alledge that Iosias *made dust* of the Altars and groves, &c. and therevpon ask whether they could not have bene put to some necessary vse, &c. If you meane a necessary vse in any measure at all, I deny not the the same: for there is nothing so small or abiect but some vse may be made thereof: and even after these things were turned into dust, there might vse be made of that dust, as there vvas: but you pervert my words if you stand servilly vnto the letter thereof: vvhereas I spoke of the great profit that might redound vnto the maintenance of the Church: and namely such as might be proportionable vnto the worth of many temples, often thousand Churches happily in some one Kingdome: and vvhat is a basket full of dust about which you trifle in comparison of this great commodity employed to supply the wants of the faithfull? 2. Touching *Iosias* his zeale compared with the law of God though I doubt not but that he respected the Glory of God and not his owne proffit: yet this hinders not but that vvith a godly zele and care of Gods people he might also have respect vnto the common benefit of them in reserving many Synagogues and houses of assembly built for the worship of God, and convert them to his service againe though they had bene polluted with Idolatry, contrary to your doctrine that requires the demolition of all such beside the temple alone. 3, as for the houses of *Dagon*, *Baal* and such like, though they were not mentioned in the x Chapter alledged by you to shew vs the example of *Iosias*, yet did I also in my formery answer, shew the warrant for their destructiō, though they might have bene turned vnto necessary vse, viz. in respect of the tēporary dispensatiō vnder Moses, though now abrogate.

x 2. Chr. 34

y pag. 22.

In

In the next place, leaving the Scriptures, you betake your self to an other help, and say in defence of your errour, that *if, I will regard later examples, I may see many Idol houses and moniments destroyed by Christian Princes, and by Bishops having leave from such, &c.* Herevnto I answer in generall, 1. VVe have here a notable spectacle of your great partiality; while you that do so often blame me for making flesh my arme, & for alledging the Examples of Reformed Churches against you even when I did it not, do yet yourself seek help of men, of Idolatrous men & fly for refuge vnto them, and to their examples to oppugne vs therewithall. VVhen *Mr. Spr.* propounded vnto your consideration, the example and indgement of z *all the pure Reformed Churches in the World, & of al the godly learned & most excellēt lights in the same, as Bucer, Martyr, Fagius, Alasco, Knoxe, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Gualter, Symler, Zanchius, Iunius, Rollocus, &c.* You answer as David did touching the armies of the heathēs & infidels and say, *though he come against you with horsmen and Charets, yet you will remember the name of the Lord, by Whose Word alone all doctrines must be tried, &c.* How much more iustly might I new answer you in your owne words, and require you to lay aside carnall confidence and to remember the name of the Lord? I may justly complaine of you as *Solomon* doth of the great evill which he saw vnder the Sunne; He saw a *Servants on horses and Princes walking as Servants on the ground*: In your examples alledged against me, you set Servants and Beggars on horsback, even the vassals & slaves of Antichrist, popish Priests & Prelates *Geroldus, Wigbertus, Ennannus* & other Lituanians & Polonians, and will have their examples to be regarded of me; and yet make Princes to walk as servants on the ground, by making base account of the judgements & examples of the truest Churches & faithfullest Ministers, propounded vnto you by others: Let those that feare the Lord judge whether this be not shamefull and grosse partiality and far from a sincere course.

z Counter-poy. Pag. 13.

Psal. 20. 7.

a Eccles. 10. 7.

2. VVe may here observe not onely, your partiality but a further deceit; for whereas in the beginning of your b last

b Pag. 35.

wri-

writing, your counsell is that *We discusse things by the Word of God, not of man:* you are herein like vnto a deceitfull champion who being to combat with an other, would aforehand agree vpon the weapon and assistance to be vsed: but yet contrary to agreement brings with him into the feeld both other weapons and assistance then he pretended at the first: for so you making shew that you would vse the sword of the spirit onely, do yet bring with you other carnall weapons and a company of hyred Souldiers which you couch closely togather and lay them in ambush: and here of a sodaine they step forth, first a band of Emperours & Princes as of *Constantine the great, Theodosius, Gaudentius, Iovius, Carolus magnus or Charles the great*; and the marching of these horsmen and Charets makes a terrible noyse in the eares of many: after these you bring forth a second band of Popish prelates, as *Geroldus, Wigbertus, Vnwannus*, to come rusling in their rochets against me: & besides these divers others. VVho would have expected such an onset, vnder your conduct, that made such shew of the contrary at the first?

3. As you have alledgedged the examples of these for breaking downe of temples, so might you as easily have alledged their examples for the maintenance of many notorious corruptions some of them for the superstitious vse of the signe of the crosse; some of them to allow primates and metropolitanes: some of them to allow even the masse itself and all the abominations of popery. VVhat weight is there in the example of such?

4. The temples which these Princes and Bishops destroyed were all of them heathnish and built by the Pagans for the worshipp of false Gods: other temples such as ours built for the service of Christ, they destroyed not, but built such themselves, as you would now have to be demolished. And suppose you could prove that the temples abused by Antichriste vvere to be destroyed as vvell as the Pagan Idolies: yet at least by the testimony and judgement of these your witnesses it vvas otherwise: so that look what the force of these examples is, it is all against

against your self and not against vs.

But to come more particularly vnto your examples: The first is, that *Constantine the Emperour rased down Venus Temple, with all Statues and moniments of it:* I answer, 1. It is vncertaine whether this thing was done by *Constantine* or not: for *Eusebius* the author that records the same is [c] often taxed for many errours in matters of fact described by him. His testimony is therfore doubtfull and not free from suspicion.

[c] R. P. de Politeia Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 23. 24. 25. 26. Scaliger. Elēc. trihæref. Serrar. c. 29

2. That Temple is recorded by *Eusebius* to have bene an extraordinary wicked place, not onely for heathnish Idolatry, but also for other monstrous and vnnaturall crimes committed in the same, which are also alledged as a cause why it was destroyed: Therfore the destruction thereof is no sufficient warrant for the subversion of our temples. 3, It is also noted by *Eusebius* in the same Chapter which you cite, that this temple of *Venus* was situate in a dearne place on a top of mount *Libanus*, out of the way & remote from conversation of men: therfore could it not even by his relation be converted vnto such necessary vses as our temples are.

4. That Idol temples were not destroyed by *Constantine*, it is confessed by an [d] other of your witnesses: Therfore though he forbade the Idolaters to vse them, yet do not your witnesses agree that his conscience required the destruction of them all together acccording to your doctrine.

[d] Theodoret Hist. lib. 5. c. 20.

The second example alledged by you is of *Constantine* also, that he destroyed *the Python in Cilicia with his temple.* I answer, 1. The truth of this fact may also be justly called into questiō, considering how vncertaine or rather fabulous things are recorded by that *Socrates* your witnesse. In the former Chapter next vnto this alledged by you there is recorded the finding out of the holy crosse by *Helena* the Mother of *Constantine*: the miraculous discerning of the same from the two other crosses of the theeves crucifyed with Christ, by the meanes of *Macarius*, &c. 2. If the things there recorded by *Socrates* be true, then was the superstition of *Constantine* verygreat; in taking a

[e] Socrates Hist. lib. 1. cap. 13.

peece of that crosse vvhich his mother found and sent vnto him, and hiding it in his owne statue or image, beleeving perfectly that the city should be preserved safe, vvhere it was kept: 2 taking also the nayles which fastned the hands of Christ vnto the crosse, and putting them in his horse-bridles and in his helmet (as an other of your Authors sayth) to repell the darts of his enimies; and to accomplish the ancient g Prophecie, touching the holynes vpon the bridles of the horses. Such examples are of no great authority with vs. 3. These Authors witnesse further that in *Constantines* time, they did h consecrate Churches, and kept feasts of dedication: that he i caused a temple to be built vvhere the temple of *Venus* had stood: and an other at the k oke of *Mamre* evē in the Idol-place vvhere heathnish sacrifices had bene offred. Do you think that such examples are to be regarded and followed?

f Theodoret Hist. lib. 1. c. 18.
g Zach. 14. 20.
h Euseb. hist. lib. 10 cap. 3.
i Socrates hist. lib. 1. c. 13.
k ibid. c. 14

For a third example you tell vs that *Theodosius commanded the temples of Idols to be overthrowne:* I answer, 1. Your historians witnessing this fact are so full of apparant fables that there is no great credit to be given vnto them. As for *Theodoret* to go no further then these chapters alledged by you: in the l first of them he telles great wonders of *Eunomius* the Bishop that alone resisted an army when others fainted, &c. in the m second place, the story of *Macedonius* the divine eremite that was ignorant of the scriptures, is related: in the n third place is the story of the Divel that at first would not suffer the fire to burne the Idol-temple, but was after driven to run away by the vertue of holy vvater and the signe of the crosse, &c. And *Sozomen* in the o Chapter next-following vnto that which you alledge telles a strange story of *Iohn Baptists* head which the mules would draw no further then to a certaine place supposed therfore to be chosen of God for the keeping of that relique: and how *Theodosius* came thither either God or the Prophet mooving him, &c. 2, *Sozomen* in the place cited by you shewes that at length many of the Idol-temples were overthrovvne by *Theodosius:* If he had thought them simply vnlavvfull according to

l Theodoret Hist. lib. 5. c. 37.
m ibid. c. 20
n ibid. c. 21.
o Sozom. lib. 7. c. 21.

to *Deut. 12.* Then is it like that not many but all of them should have bene destroyed by him. And besides he p shevves that the temple of *Bacchus* in Alexandria was converted vnto the vse of the Christians vnder *Theodosius*: That in the temple of *Serapis*, there was heard to be sung *Alleluia*, by a strange voyce, no person being seene for a token that Christians should afterwards sing psalmes for the worship of God in that place. 3, In the first place which you alledge out of *Theodoret*, there is also mention made of a certaine impudent monke or contemplative person that brought the conscience of *Theodosius* into bondage with a vaine excommunication, &c. And therfore not the consciences of such men but the word of God which is the perfect law of liberty must be our guide.

p ibid. c. 15

In the fourth place you alledge, that *Gaudentius and Iovius ruinated such places in the reigne of Honorius.* Answ. 1. Though they did so in one city, in *Carthage*, yet this shewes not that they did so in other places, or that they thought all others bound to imitate their example: for oftentimes such works are done vpon occasion of particular respects and speciall provocations, which at other times and places they would not doe: as vvas also noted before in the practise of *Constantine* the great. 2. As for *Augustine* your Author, though he approve this fact in them; yet it appeares els vvhere, that at some other times and places he q allowed the reteyning of them: and shewes reason for their converting to religious vses, *even as sacrilegious and impious persons themselves are changed or converted vnto true religion:* And his reason is not to be despised: seing living temples of the divel abused vnto Idolatry being more capable of the infection of sin may be employed and turned vnto the service of God; why not other dead temples made of vvood and stone? 3. This your vvitnesse doth yet further condemne you, in that he r allovves the converting of Idol-temples and groves vnto the vvorship of the true God, or vnto other common and publique vses, but not vnto other private vses and commodities: vvhereas on the contrary you that do deny such publique vse

q Augustin. ad Publicolā Epist. 154.
r Ibidem.

of them in the ſervice of God, are yet content to employ them to your owne private vſe and benefit as by ſtudy in the library,&c.

Your fift example is, that *Carolus magnus when he had conquered Saxonie, did the like to the Idolies of Maydenburgh and Mars mount.* I anſwer. 1, *Cranzius* the popiſh writer whom you alledge for theſe things is of ſuch authority, that for many matters the golden legend of lyes deſerves as much credit as he: He telles ſ of ſtrange apparitious at noone day made vnto virgins for the receiving of *Henricus* the new Biſhop: and of the great miracles that t *Evermodus* the Biſhop wrought in looſing the chaynes of priſoners by the holy water that he ſprinckled vpon them: and how in the open congregation he beat out the vnmercifull divel that would not forgive the murdrer. He records how u *Vicelinus* the Biſhop after his death appeared vnto a certaine woman complaining that the almes which were given for his ſoules health were not duely beſtowed by *Folcardus* the Prieſt to whom that buſines was cõmitted,&c. And that he appeared vnto an other virgin, ſending her to *Eppo* his old frend that lamẽted his death, to comfort him and to ſignify vnto him, that he caryed his teares in his garment which was vpon him white as ſnow: And he ſhewes alſo what a miracle he wrought vpon a blinde woman vnto whom he appeared in a dreame and reſtored her ſight by printing the ſigne of the croſſe vpon her eyes, &c. He x records how *Carolus magnus* having begun to build a Church at *Eltze*, and that dying his Sonne *Lodowick* ſucceeded him, who riding a hunting on a certaine day, & hearing Maſſe in the field, his chaplaine left the facred relicks behind him, to wit, ſome of the milk of *S. Mary*, and of the haires of her head which he had hung vpon a tree: but being come back and miſſing the ſame, ran againe with haſt vnto the tree where he left them, but being come could by no meanes of any ſtrength pluck them away from the tree. This they judged to be a ſigne that *Mary* had choſen that place to dwell in and ſo they tranſlated the Church begun at *Elt-*

ſ Cranzius VVandalia lib. 5. c. 41.

t cap. 42.

u Ibid lib 4 cap. 19.

v Ibid. c. 20

x Saxoniæ lib. 2. c. 26.

Eltze vnto this place, &c. 2, In the place y alledged by you, he ſhewes that this *Charles* the great when he had broken downe the temple of *Venus* at *Maydenburgh*, did erect an other even in the ſame place vnto the honour of *St. Stephen*: and ſo deſtroying one Idol-temple he ſet vp an other. Had I alledged againſt you ſuch examples and ſuch Authors, then had it bene time for you to have called me, z to the law & to the teſtimony.

y Ibid. c. 3

z Eſa. 8.

In the ſixt place you come from Emperours and Princes vnto Biſhops, deſtroying Idol-temples; and here you tell how *Marcus Biſhop of Arethuſa performed the like ſervice in Conſtantines dayes.* But (not to ſpeak further of the authors vncertainty that records this fact) ſeing the deſtruction of Tẽples is a worke of the civil Magiſtrate, and by them to be executed as your ſelf confeſſe; how could *Marcus* performe this work without vſurpacion of the civil ſword? If you ſay that leave and authority from the Prince did warrant him thus to do, then by the like grant and warrant from Princes you may allow Biſhops to be high commiſſioners and civill Magiſtrates: And they may as well alledge theſe examples of Biſhops for maintenance of their double authority, as you do for the deſtruction of temples. But more particularly touching this example when you come afterwards to alledge it the ſecond time.

Your 7th. example is of *Biſhop Porphyrie that ſhewed the like zele at Gaza.* I anſwer, 1. It appeares out of *Sigonius* in the place you alledg, that Biſhop *Porphyrie*, was ſtird vp vnto this fact by the iniuries that he received from the gentiles which prevayled in *Gaza:* and therfore his zele againſt Idolies is not very evident. 2, The maner of dealing which this Biſhop and the Biſhop of *Cæſarea* that joyned with him, did vſe in Prophecying vnto the empreſſe *Eudoxia* touching a Sonne to be borne vnto her, to win her aſsiſtance in this matter, makes their zele the more to be ſuſpected. 3. Their Baptiſing of the Emperours Childe with the ſigne of the croſſe even at the ſame time when they got licenſe to deſtroy the Idol-temples at *Gaza*, doth ſhew that you may as well alledge their examples for the

maintenance of other superstitions, as for the countenancing of your opinion in this controversie.

Your 8. example is of *Bishop Abdas that did the like among the Persians, vpon their temples consecrated to the fire.* I answer, That *Cassiodorus* who relates this fact (not in the 3. booke, as you cite the same, but in the 10. book and 3. Chapter of his tripartite history) doth also iustly reprove the same, both by the a example of Paul who though he shewed the errour of the *Athenians*, yet did he not himself destroy their altars and idols; as this bishop did without any lawful authority: as also by the woful evēt that followed, namely that vpon this fact all the Churches of the Christians were destroyed and overthrowne by the Persians; and not onely this; but hereupon also was raysed a most cruell and extreme persecution of the Christians which continued for the space of 30 yeares together. And if this example ought to be followed, then ought you and your people to come with your hammers to break our temples, but I need not to dehort you from such folly.

a Act. 17. 22 23. &c.

Your 9. example is that *Iohn Chrysostome sent men to do the like worke in Phœnicia.* Answ. 1. The men whom he sent about this worke, were (as the author alledged by you b shewes) *monkes inflamed with divine zele:* if you had alledged this testimony so in your authors owne wordes, the weaknes of such exāples would the better have appeared vnto the readers: for thereby they might have discerned your author commending monkes, and shewing the antiquity of monasticall life, as well as he shewes the ruine of Temples. 2. If the example of *Chrysostome* be of any worth in your eyes, we may then alledge the same against your oppugning of set formes of prayer, which he allowed in the worship of God, as appeares by the hymnes and antiphones which as an other of your witnesses c recordeth) he made for the Christians to vse in their feasts of the Sabath and the Lords day at their nocturnal assemblies, &c.

b Theodoret. lib. 5. c. 29.

c Socrates hist. lib. 6. c. 8.

Your 10th. example is that *Bishop Geroldus burned to ashes, a grove which the Sclavi had in sacred reverence.* Answer. As for *Helmoldus*, your author that records this story; 1. He was a popish

pish masse priest; His name in the native speech signifies * *Hell-mouth*, a fit memorial to shew how you goe from the mouth of God to Hell mouth for testimony in this controversie; for as is his name, so is his book, repleni shed with many fables, lying visions and miracles wrought by the signe of the crosse, & some of them the same that I noted before out of *Cranzius*, & therfore his record is not much to be regarded; 2. He d confesseth that he was the scholler of this *Geroldus*, his venerable Mr. and that by his persuasion he was drawne to write this story: And therfore being so fabulous in other parts of this writing, is yet more to be suspected of flattery in this which he saith touching his Maister. 3. He was also an ignorant historian, & erres grosly in the very e entrance into his booke where he writes that the *Baltique sea is so called because by a long tract it is stretched out in manner of a girdle or belt through the Scythian regions even vnto Græcia*, contrary vnto the testimony of all Cosmographers & of dayly experience: He is herein refuted even by f *Cranzius* him self your other witnesse. His skill in Geography seemes to be like vnto yours, when by a like though a g ea er errour, contrary to the description of mappes, and contrary to the testimony of the Scriptures you do write cōcerning the limits of the tribe of *Isachar*, that g *it had the Philistians at one end, and the Ammonites on the other, that vexed them:* where as by h conference of scriptures shewing the topography and situation of the tribes, that tribe of *Isachar* had neither the *Philistins* on the one side of their limits nor the *Ammonites* on the other, neither is there any colour of reason, why the tribe of *Isachar* in speciall should be sayd to couch downe in respect of any vexation by the *Philistins* or *Ammonites*. Such is your ignorance of history, when speaking of *Tarsus* mentioned in *Act.* 21. 34 you call it i *the cheefe city of Cilicia in Syria*; as if you should have sayd, *London* the cheefe city of *Middlesex*, in *Scotland*; or *Amsterdam* the cheefe city of *Holland* in *France*: you might as well have sayd that *Samaria* was in *Galile*; or Iudea in *Moab*, as have sayd that *Cilicia* was in Syria: not onely k Cosmographers but the holy l Scripture it self

* Etymologie. Teufel-maul in propriis nominibus.

d Helmod. epist. ad canonicos Lubic.

e lib. 1. c. 1.

f Vvandaliæ lib. 2. c. 17.

g Annot. on psal. 68. 14.

h Iosh. 13. 10. & 15. 45. &c. & 19. 17. &c.

i Annot. on psal. 48. 8

k Ptolomæus. Geogr. lib 5. cap. 7

it self doth often distinguish those countries one frō an other. Act. 15. 23 41. Gal. 1. 21

An other the like errour you commit in the same place, when speaking of that Tarsus in Cilicia, you say: *from thence they went by shipping into farr countreyes, Africa, India, Ophir, &c. 1. Kin. 22. 48. & 10. 22.* For those voyages mentioned in the booke of the Kings were not from *Cilicia* into *Ophir* by sayling through the Mediterranean Sea, as they needes must if they had gone from Tarsus: but 1. both a firme continent was in the way to hinder their passage, and the scripture it self [m] shewes that the shippes intended for that voyage mentioned *1. Kin. 22.* were made at *Ezion geber*, a city situate vpon the red-sea, from whence there was a convenient passage into *India*. These your errours in misplacing of countries are like vnto Mr. Smyths errour in misplacing of the brazen altar, and if your reasoning therevpō against Mr. Smyth be sound, then may I vpon the like occasion of Helmoldus, and of your errours observe against you in your owne words, and say: [n] *God would let the reader see how you are given over to blindnes of heart, in iudging spirituall things: by that blindnes which is in you in discerning carnall things, and which are set before all mens eyes.* As for *Geroldus* the popish Bishop, whose example you object vnto me: 1. It doth not agree with that which you propounded to shew at the beginning viz. the examples of *Christian Princes & of Bishops having leave from such*: for where doth it appeare that he had such *leave* to do this thing? It doth rather appeare, to be a sodaine motion, and an occasional thing falling out in his iourney, when the story shewes that [o] meeting with such a grove in his way he lept from his horse, and fell vpon that worke exhorting others to follow him. 2. The destruction of such a Grove is not to be matched with the destruction of our temples, in respect of the necessary vse wherevnto they may be employed in the service of God, so as those trees and hedges could not. 3, It is noted of this *Geroldus*, that he [p] went to Roome to be consecrated & made Bishop by the Pope; and though in the way the theeves met him and smote and wounded him in the forehead, yet would

m 2. Chron. 20. 36.

n Defence against Mr. Sm. pag. 12

o Helmold. Chron. Slavor. lib. 1. c. 84.

p Cranzius V Vandal. lib. 4. c. 21.

would not that Balam turne back or desist from his journey: that he [q] also consecrated a Church in *Oldenburgh* vnto the honour of *St. Iohn Baptist*, &c. Thus you see that your Cosin Mr. *Iohn Ainsw.* might have alledged the example of this *Geroldus* against your self for the defence of all popery, even as you do against vs for the destruction of our temples.

q Ibid. c. 26 Helmold. vbi supra.

Your 11th example is that *Wigbertus Bishop of Mersburgh did likewise:* If he did but likewise, then the like answer may serve for this, that was given vnto the former examples. Touching this popish *Wigbert*, it is "recorded indeed that he did destroy a certaine grove consecrate vnto the Idole *Zuttiber*, and reduced it vnto a plaine: but it is withall recorded that he did in the same place build a Chappel vnto an other Idol, namely vnto *St. Roman*. And where he had remooved the heathnish Idolatry, even in the same place he set vp popish Idolatry. Are we to be guided by such examples?

" Magdeb. centur. 11. cap. 10. col. 602.

Your 12th. Example is that *Vnwannus of Häburgh cut downe all the idolatrous groves in his dioceſſe*. I answer, 1. It is to be observed how you omit the title of this *Vnwannus*, being Archbishop of Hamburgh, as your author in the[r] place alledged by you doth acknowledge: So before you omitted the title of *Chrysostome* being Archbish. of *Constantinople*: Those that were but Bishops you give all them their titles: but not so to either of the Archbishops. It seemes you thought that so long as any were called Bishops, the reader might conceave they were no vsurping Bishops: and so have regarded their examples the more, that name being given by the holy Ghost vnto his ministers: but if you had named Archbishops, the reader might have conceaved the weaknes of their examples, serving as well to stablish the primacy of Archbishops, as to destroy temples. 2, It is further to be observed, that this *Vnwannus* was not onely an Archbishop but also a popish Archbishop, that [s] received his pall of Pope *Benedict the 8t.* that he built chappels in honour of Saincts, as that of *S. Vitus* at *Breme*. The reader that considers this, might think that his example in destroying temples is of

r Cranz. Metrop. l. 4 c. 1.

s Ibidem.

leſs weight, when he gave ſo foule an example for building Idolatrous temples. 3, even that which *Vnwannus* did in cutting downe groves is againſt yourſelf: for of the groves he made Churches: t *ex lucis fecit eccleſias renovari*, &c. This had bene vnlawfull in the time of the lavv: The groves of the Canaanites might not be converted vnto ſuch vſe. If this example of the Archbiſhop may be imitated, then is the commandement in *Deut.12.* a ceremoniall and temporary ordinance, not binding vs in theſe times.

t Ibidem.

Your 13th. Example is, that *in Lituania, the temples & Altars of Idols were demoliſhed.* According to your owne authors the thing vvas done on this maner: u *Iagello* an heathen King of *Lituania* ſeeking to obtaine *Heduigis* Queene of Poland for his wife, doth promiſe as a condition of the mariage, that his whole countrey ſhall become Chriſtians. Herevpon w his people being hardly drawne vnto it: he is Baptiſed and named *Wladiſlaus:* this honour is vouchſafed onely to him and to his nobles: becauſe it vvas counted too great a labour to baptiſe the common people, therfore they ſtanding by great troopes & companies together in ſtead of baptiſing were ſprinckled vvith holy water: and but one name given to ech company as well of men as women: then by the Kings comandement they deſtroy the Temple, Altar and oracle at *vilna*: the grove is cut downe and the living Serpents which they worſhipped were killed: a new Church is built at *Vilna*, and is conſecrated to the memory of S. *Staniſlaus* by *Bozentas* Archbiſhop of *Cracow*: then *Andreas vaſilo* a polonian of the order of the Franciſcanes is inſtituted Biſhop at *vilna*: And the King ſends an Ambaſſadour vnto pope *Vrban* to promiſe obedience vnto him. Your other x Author addes further, that there were thirty thouſand of the Lituanians Baptiſed in one day, & this of the polonian Prieſts which were ignorant of the Lituanian tongue: He y ſaith alſo: *Heduigis* was firſt betrothed vnto *Vilelmus* Duke of Auſtria her father being alive: that theſe two were joyned in Mariage alſo by the nobles of *Polãd* in the caſtle of *Cracow*: but immediately

u Cromerus de orig. & rebusgeſtis polonorũ lib. 14. & lib. 15.

x Alexand. Guagninus in Sarmatiæ Europeæ deſcript.

y In Polonorũ regũ deſcript.

tely againe ſo ſoone as the Lituanian Kings coming was knowne, they expell the Duke, violate the mariage and vrge the Queene againſt her minde to mary with the King. This is the worthy example that you propound vnto vs. From this barbarous adulterer and Idolaters conſcience you will informe and illuminate the eyes and conſciences of all faithfull miniſters and people at this day: from the rude and blinde practiſe of theſe whom by your owne profeſſion you cannot eſteeme to be otherwiſe then a falſe Church, you inſult againſt all the Churches of Chriſte: And of theſe mungrilles, halfe heathens, and half Papiſts you ſay of them with the reſt, that *all theſe beare witneſſe to the true meaning of Gods law vvritten in their hearts other wiſe then in ours, &c.*

Your laſt example is, *And now of late the Chriſtians in France* (*as at* Rochel) *ruinated the popiſh temples there.* I anſwer, 1. Had you noted any Chronicle or good writers where this act is particularly deſcribed, with the circumſtances and occaſion hereof, the reader might thereby have had ſatisfactiõ touching the ſame, which now your writing doth not afford. 2, As for ruinating ſome popiſh temples, it is that which hath alſo bene practiſed in divers other countries, and even in this city as that of the Minorites, &c. Yet this hinders not but that they have the true meaning of Gods law written in their hearts otherwiſe then in yours that require all ſuch of neceſsity to be deſtroyed, and do alſo ſeparate from the worſhip of God in all ſuch places: As Iſrael was to deſtroy z *Iericho* the firſt city of Canaan which they came vnto after they paſſed Iorden; and to keep others for their vſe: ſo many Chriſtians in the beginning of the reformation to ſhew their deteſtation of popery deſtroyed ſome popiſh temples, and yet reſerved the reſt for their neceſſary vſe in the ſervice of God. 3. As for them of *Rochel* in particular; the ancienteſt miniſters of the French Church in this city, as they have teſtifyed vnto me, do not know, neither can learne by any enquiry of their people, ſome whereof have formerly bene members of that particular Church of *Rochel*,

z Ioſh. 6. & 7. ch.

that ever the Christians there did make any question or scruple of worshipping God with the rest of their brethren in any popish temples being once purged from their Idolatry. And therfore vntill you bring better evidence of that which you write, we have reason to hold the exãple of *Rochel* for our selves against you. 4. Vpon further enquiry, I am "now of late advertised by letters from *Monsieur Loumeau* a reverend minister of the Church of *Rochel*; that the ruinating of some temples there vvas done not because they thought it vnlawfull to vse them, but least the Papists should have them; that some of them were broken downe in respect of civil necessitie, because they were of importance for fortification in their warres: that at the same time when they ruinated some, yet they reserved others for their vse in the worship of God; as namely, a litle temple of the *Nonnes*, wherein they preached long time after others were destroyed: and also that of the *Convent of the Augustines*, wherein (as he testifyeth) they do still preach vnto this day. This being so, every one may plainely see how you abuse and pervert the examples of the Christians in the Reformed Churches as though they were witnesses for you and abettours of your folly. If a feare of pollution in the vse of them had caused them to pluck them downe: then might their consciences have bene polluted with the vse of those two which they reserved, as well as with the rest. 5. The * testimony of *Beza* is, that the overthrow of temples in *France* was done tumultuously in the civil warres, not according to knowledge, that it was not approved by their confession and doctrine; That he himself could be a witnesse thereof, being present at the warres from the beginning to the end: That he and his fellow ministers did often admonish the Princes and captaines: and did labour to hinder those enterprises which fell out in that disorder, but could not. You might as vvell plead that private houses and palaces of Papists were to be destroyed, because the vnruly Souldiers in the heat of war, did sometimes destroy them also. Againe for the overthrow of them in some other places,

" Anno 1618. Iun. 8.

* Acta Colloquij Mõpelgart. Pag. 398.

places, *Beza* // avoucheth vpon his owne knowledge and the testimony of the cities, that they were constreyned to do it for their safety against the violatours of publique peace, the situation of the temples necessarily requiring the same. And this is the same reason that M. *Loumeau* alledged before, as one cause of their practise in *Rochel*. And while they were guided by such civil respects, this argues no scruple of conscience in the vse of such temples. 6. Suppose that this one Church of *Rochel* did condemne our vse of temples, which you are not like to prove; yet th'other Churches in France, and that of *Geneva* also, (as many in this city vpon their ovvne knowledge do testify) do still keep the temples formerly abused vnto popery, for their necessary vse in the service of God. And *Rochel* being layd in the balance against the rest would be too light, & weak to abolish the necessary vse which we have of our temples.

// Respõs. Theod. Be. ad acta colloq. Mõp. part. 2. thes. 1.

Section. 5.

VNto the Scriptures Act 17 & 19. by vs alledged: you say as before, that those things were of no necessary vse. Wherto I answer, that as ther is no necessary vse of this your reason, so were it stronger then it is, yet would it not break the force of our argument, which is in regard that they are nourishments of superstition, and therfore to be abolished. For wil you for your own proffit and vse, nourish superstition and Idolatrie? Have you no otherwise learned the Law of God? How vnlike are you herein to Marcus Bishop of Arethusia, *who having at the Commandement of* Constantine *pulled down a temple of Idols, and being after accused by the* Arethusians *to Iulian for a traytor: he was miserably tortured, to inforce him eyther to build the temple againe, or to pay for the building: which he refusing, they promised to forgive him half. After that, denying but a small summ, he sayd, It is great wickednes to give a half peny in case of impietie, as if a man should bestow the whole. He for this is registred with honour in your own* a *book of Martyrs. How much better then you, did the Emperour* Theodosius, *who when* Constantine *had shut vp*

Hen. Ainsw.

Sozom. l. 5. Theodor. l. 3.

a Acts & Monumẽts p. 89. edit. Ao. 1610.

certaine Idol-temples, but destroyed them not: and after, Iulian *opened and restored them: & others after him, shut them vp: and others*
b theodoret l. 5. c. 20 & 37. *againe opened them*: Theodosius *coming to the crown* b *destroyed them vtterly, that no footsteps of the ancient errour might appeare to*
c2 thes. 2.4 *posteritie. And had you minded the scripture which we cite, you might see how th' Apostle calleth them their* Devotions (Sebasmata) *Act. 17.23. which word being vsed by him elswhere* c *in his Propheste of the Pope should teach vs to abhorre his temples, Altars, images, &c. which are his* Sebasmata *or* Devotions *in like manner, & not onely vnnecessary, but hurtfull to the world. And could not the Chri-*
d Act. 19.19 *stians which burned their books of curious arts*, d *whose price was 50000. peices of Silver, have put them to some other necessary vse then for the fyre? Although there were many evil things in them, yet doe you not think there were some good things also? wherof (when the other were put out) much profit, and some good vse might have been made. Our generation is wiser, that can refine the Popes Mass book, and make therof a Communion book, not for civil vse onely, but for the highest spiritual vse, to worship God therby: and so having som what purged his temples, they put them to two of the 4. religious vses which Antichrist made them for: so greatly doe they esteme of his Devotions.*

Answer.

Ioh. Pa. HEre in the first place to shew that there is no proffit of this distinction of *necessary vse*, you aske *whether we will for our owne proffit and vse, nourish superstition and Idolatry*; *whether we have no otherwise learned the law of God, &c.* I answer, 1. VVe do not for our owne proffit breake the law of God; but God for our proffit hath changed his owne law: And they that do deny this, do deny the proffit which comes by the death of Christ, and dis honour his merit. The benefit of Christ vouch safed vs herein is exceeding great & vnspeakable: Through his
a Levit. 11. b 1. Tim. 4. &c. death we come more fully to enioy the fullnes of the earth: The meates which before were a vncleane, are now b sanctifyed for

for our vse: and millions of treasure are gained yearely hereby: Againe, the cleane beasts & meates, which were of old in c great abundance consumed in sacrifice, by thousands at once some time, are now given wholly vnto vs: and the benefit redounding hence every yeare is not to be reckoned: The vnspeakable cost of travelling from all places vnto the temple of the Lord is now d taken away, &c. Yea besides this, the liberty of enjoying things abused vnto idolatry and defiled by Idolaters is now granted vnto vs; as the e cities, houses, cattell and goods of Idolatrous apostates: the meates sacrificed vnto Idols: & consequently in like maner the holy places and temples of Idolaters, which before were vnlawful are now grãted vnto vs: for he that hath now given vs his owne Sonne to dy for vs, f *how shall he not with him give vs all things also:* now g *all things are ours*; & h nothing to be denyed vs, or refused by vs. Those that with the Iewes do oppugne this truth and count it a carnall doctrine are such as vnder pretext of mainteyning the law, do pervert the Gospell in a speciall poynt thereof. Among all the snares and entisements drawing vnto superstition and Idolatry and nourishing the same, there were none more strong and effectuall, then the i having of Idolatrous wives and husbands, in so much that God commanded the k putting away of such even after mariage: whereas now since the death of Christ, for the benefit and commoditie of Christian families, God l doth not require such mariages to be dissolved being once made: And this is an evident proofe that God hath now otherwise determined and declared his meaning touching the occasions of superstition in case of necessary vse, then he had vnder the law. 2. Even your *Maimony*, whose expositions you do so often commend vnto vs, whom you note to be so precise in avoyding things polluted with Idolatry, is not yet so precise in denying this exception of *necessary vse*, as you yourself are. For he having first "shewed that it is vnlawfull to follow the heathens in wearing their kinde of apparel and in cutting the haire after their maner, doth yet thus interpret himself: "*An Israelite that is a*

c Numb 18 1. Kin. 3. 4 & 8. 5.
d Ioh. 4. 21.
e Deut. 13.
f Rõ. 8. 32.
g 1. Cor. 3. 21. 22. 23.
h 1. Tim. 4.
i Deut. 7. 3. 4. 1. Kin. 11. 4.
k Ezra. 10. 3 1 Cor. 7. 12. 13 &c.
" Maim. in Misn. in Abodah zarah cap. 11. sec. 1.
" ibid. sec. 3

cour-

courtier and hath neceſsitie of ſitting before the Kings of the gentiles; if it be a diſhonour vnto him that he is not like vnto them: behold, it is then lawfull for him to put on their apparell, and to be ſhaved according to the maner that they vſe. Are not you more then Iewiſhly ceremonious in this poynt, vvhich deny that liberty vnto Chriſtians, which the Iewes permit? 3. But you do elſwhere contradict yourſelves herein, for vvhereas you grant it to be m *lawfull to pray and preach in Idol-temples, as there might be occaſion, if they were made priſons and you committed thither:* it followes hereupon, that either you muſt confeſſe the commandement in *Deut. 12. 2.* as it is expounded by you againſt the worſhip of God in Idol-temples, to be a ceremoniall commandement, in that you will have it give place vnto that *neceſſity* which the priſon brings with it, and ſo yeeld the praying, preaching and worſhiping of God to be lavvfull in that place, vvhich othervviſe you condemne; or els you muſt graunt that the morall lavv itſelf (if that commandement of aboliſhing Idol-temples be ſuch) doth alſo give place vnto neceſsitie; and conſequently that if you were in priſon, it ſhould alſo be lawfull for you in ſuch a ſtrait and neceſſitie to ſweare, forſweare, lye, ſteale, kill and vſe treachery, or break any other commandement of the morall Law, as well as this of worſhipping God in Idol-temples. Either therfore confeſſe your fault in denying this commandement to be ceremoniall, or els ſhew vs your diſpenſation to break one commandement of the morall law rather then an other, when you come into priſon. In the meane time we hold that he which for his commodity, or neceſſity n breakes one of the leaſt of the morall commandements and teacheth men ſo, is guilty of all, and ſhalbe called leaſt in the Kingdome of heaven.

m Inquiry of Th. wh. p. 56. 57.

n Iam. 2. 10. Mat. 5. 19.

In the next place you alledge the example of *Marcus Biſhop of Arethuſa* who endured great torture rather then to give one half peny towards the building of an Idol-temple: who for this is regiſtred with honour in our owne book of Martyts; & you aſk, *how vnlike* I am to him. I anſwer, 1. It is not recorded that

that he refuſed to worſhip God in ſuch a place purged from Idolatry; but that he would not help forward the building of ſuch a place, when he knew it ſhould be employed to the ſervice of Idols: neither am I herein vnlike vnto him, for I hold it to be the duety of a Chriſtian man rather to dy then to give any thing for the furtherance of Idolatry, though it were but a half peny. 2, if the example of this one Martyr be worthy to be regarded, how much more the reſt, which in ſo great a number like a cloude of witneſſes or Martyrs, are regiſtred in our book of Martyrs, al bearing witneſſe againſt you touching the vſe of temples formerly abuſed vnto Idolatry in England and other places? *How vnlike* are you vnto them all? do they not all condemne your ſchiſming from the churches of Chriſt vpon ſuch pretences? do they not all ſhew the meaning of Gods law to be written in their hearts otherwiſe then in yours? 3, for yourſelf in ſpeciall, I may rather aſk you and ſay: *how vnlike* are you vnto this conſtant and patient Martyr, he enduring ſo much for his religion, and you ſo often changing your religiō, and ſtayning your ſelf ſo many times with apoſtaſy, as hath bene o ſhewed before. Yet you tell vs, p *you truſt, that God will one day rayſe vp an other Iohn fox to gather and compile the Acts & monuments of his later martyrs, for the vew of poſterity, &c.* vvhen this your owne booke of martyrs ſhalbe compiled and publiſhed, what place or memoriall can you expect therein (if things be faithfully regiſtred) but ſuch as *D. Perne* hath in our book of Martyrs for his often turning of his coate?

o pag. 51

p Preface to confeſſ. of faith edit. Ao. 1596.

Moreover, whereas you do againe repeate the example of *Theodoſius*, wherevnto I have already given anſwer in the former ſection; I do yet further anſwer, that your allegation that he *vtterly deſtroyed* the Idol-temples, is contradicted and refuted even by the other examples cited by your ſelf: for if after this, the Idol-temples at *Gaza*, at *Carthage* and in *Phenicia* were deſtroyed vnder the reigne of *Arcadius* and *Honorius* which ſucceeded and followed *Theodoſius* in the empire, then were they not vtterly deſtroyed by that *Theodoſius* of whom *Theodoret* ſpeakes.

speakes, in the places by you alledged. As it is a sure argument that all the high places were not vtterly destroyed in the dayes of *Asa*, because *Iehosaphat*, which came after him, destroyed some, that remayned vnto his time: even so it is a sure token that all the Idol temples were not vtterly destroyed in the dayes of *Theodosius*, whiles according to your owne example others were destroyed in the times succeeding by *Iovius and Gaudentius*, by *Porphyrie* and by *Chrysostome* with his monkes.

q 2. Chron. 15.6.

Further, to prove our temples vnnecessary, you plead that *the Apostle calleth them their devotions* (*Sebasmata*) *Act. 17. 23. which word being elswhere vsed by him in his Prophesie of the Pope: should teach vs to abhorre his temples, &c.* Answer. 1, though Paul mention the Devotions or *Sebasmata* of the Athenians Act. 17. yet doth it not follow that he speakes of their temples, themselves, for he might see their devotions though he saw not their temples: the r maner of Idolaters being to have their Altars and images in streetes, and marke places, and by the way-sides and this many times without any houses or temples built over them. If the open places w here such devotions were publiquely performed, I should be abolish ed as vnnecessary, then not onely houses and temples but streets and market places were in like manner also to be destroyed and made desolate, for as much as they also had bene places to nourish superstition. 2, as for the w ord *Sebasma* vsed againe *2. Thes. 2 4.* in a prophesie of the Pope, that may well be expounded of the Maiesty and honourable estate of Kings and Emperours, above w hom the Pope exalteth himself and thereby is know ne to be Antichrist; the s like words being elsw here againe vsed to expres s the same dignity: yet doth not the attributing of this word vnto Princes prove them to be of no necessary vse. If your reasoning were found, the Anabaptists by the like argument might abolish & condemne the estate of emperours and Kings because of these titles given vnto them.

r Ier. 11. 13

s Sebastos & Sebaste. Act. 25. 21 25, &. 27. 1

Lastly, you reason thus; *could not the Christians which burned their books of curious arts, whose t price was 50000. pieces of silver, have*

t Act. 19. 19

have put them to some other necessary vse then for the fire? Although there were many evill things in them, yet do you not think, that there were some good things also? whereof (when the other were put out) much proffit, and some good vse might have bene made, &c. Answer. 1, what you or I may think and coniecture touching *some good things* being in those bookes that were burned at Ephesus, it skilles not much: If you could prove that such good things were in them, your obiection or instance might then have had the greater colour to deceave a simple reader. 2, suppose there were some good things in them, whereof much proffit and some good vse might have bene made, then I say that the evill things being put our, (which you also admit by suppositiō) we are not absolutely bound at al times to abolis h such bookes but may keep them for that good vse which may be reaped thereby: neither doth that example *Act. 19.* 19. binde vs to the cōtrary; for if Bellarm. repēting of his Idolatrous studies, & you of your schismatical studies, should in a holy revēge & detesta- u 2. Cor. 7. tiō of your errours freely burne your deceitful bookes for a sa- 11. crifice vnto the Lord as w David powred out the water vnto the vv 2. Sā. 23. Lord which he had longed for: yet this hinders not but that o- 16. 17. thers might lawfuly reteine the same bookes of yours for the cō-victiō of such as had not repēted of your errours. The bookes of *Bellarmine* of *Becanus*, of *Vorstius* have bene of late justly burned by divers Christian Princes, and yet some bookes of the same kinde are justly reteyned by others for some good vse that may be made of them. 3, if Idolatrous bookes & such as are of curious arts may not be reteyned for some good vse of them, when the evill things are put out: then how guilty are you that reteyne such bookes and that for religious vse even whiles the evill things are not put out of them: This your vse of such bookes appeares in the manifold testimonies w hich you bring and alledge out of them. 4, by this your reteyning and reading of Idolatrous bookes you do plainely condemne and overthrow yourself in this question of temples: for seing Idolatrous bookes are strong nourishments of Idolatry vnto many, yea

far more effectuall therevnto then are any ſhapes of Idolatrous buildings; if you can ſtill allow the keeping and vſing of ſuch bookes, while the evill things are not put out, how partiall are you that will not allow the keeping of temples abuſed vnto Idolatry, even when the images, Altars and Idolatrous worſhip are put out of them? And you do yet further condemne yourſelf herein, becauſe in expounding the decalogue you make x *the reading of Idolatrous bookes* to be a breach of the ſecond cõmandemẽt as well as building of temples vnto Idols. Now the breach of the ſecond commandement is ſimply a ſin: and the building of a temple vnto Idols is an heynous ſin though the reteyning of them when they are converted to the true worſhip of God be not ſo. Thus by your practiſe contrary to your doctrine, you ſtreyne out a Gnat and ſwallow a Camel, in diſpenſing with the vſe of Idolatrous bookes, while you condemne the vſe of our temples. How can you blame the Magiſtrates for not vſing their power to aboliſh our temples, whiles yourſelf having power to aboliſh ſome Idolatrous bookes, do yet keep them for your vſe and refuſe to burne them? That which you ſay of a communion book is beſide the preſent queſtion: your vnreverent ſpeeches and blaſphemies touching the ſame, notwithſtanding any faults therein, may be ſhewed in due time.

x Annot. on Exo. 20. 5.

Section. 6.

Hen. Aint.

BVt you find (you ſay) an idolatrous place converted vnto the ſervice of God, Act. 19. 9. 10. the ſchoole of Tyrannus, *being as the reſt of the hetheniſh ſchooles, the nurſeries of ſuperſtition, &c. Wherto I anſwer: Firſt you barely affirme and prove not that it was an hetheniſh ſchoole: for there might be a Iewes ſchoole in Epheſus,* a *as well as there was a Iewes* a *ſynagogue: and by the Hebrewes canons,* b *they were bound to have ſchooles in every citie and in every countrie, as wel as ſynagogues. Neyther doth the Schoolmaiſters Greek name* Tyrannus *hinder, but he might be a Iew: for in Rom. 16. Iewes had names both Greek and Latine: yea* Turnus *or* Turannus *is a name*

a Act. 19. 8.

b Maimony in thalmud thorah. c. 2.

name mentioned of the Hebrew doctors, as is the Greek name Schoole *alſo. And* Tyrannus *might favour the trueth, (as did* Criſpus and Soſthenes c *rulers of the ſynagogue) when others blaſphemed it. Secondly, if it were an hetheniſh ſchoole as you ſay, yet I deny that it was an Idolie, or place devote to deſtruction by the law in Deut. 12. or any other. For God never commanded that hetheniſh ſchooles, (wherin humane arts and Philoſophie were taught, though idolatrie with them) ſhould be deſtroyed, any more then other civil houſes. And this is called the ſchoole of* Tyrannus *a man, and not the ſchoole of* Iupiter, Apollo, *or any hethen God or Goddeſſe, as the temples had their names* d *of ſuch.* Daniel *alſo and his brethren, (who ſtrictly* e *kept Moſes ordinances, refuſed not* f *the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans, among whom idolatrie was taught, as among other hethens. Neyther was there any ſuch converſion of this ſchoole to the ſervice of God, as you mention: for Paul diſputed dayly in the ſchoole, and turned it not from a ſchoole to a Chriſtian ſynagogue, but it continued a ſchoole ſtill. By which (if you apply it to an Idolie) you may conclude that Idol-temples may be vſed vnto the ſervice of God, whiles the idol-ſervice is continued alſo in them. Moreover it appeareth by the 10. verſe that both Iewes and Greeks heard Paul there diſputing as they* g *had doen in the ſynagogues; but the Iewes hold it vnlawfull to come into an Idol temple, and they were vnder Moſes politie (as whileare you ſpake) vntill they were converted to Chriſt. Finally in ages folowing, Chriſtians who altogither refuſed communion with the hethens in their Idolies, and ſacrifices: yet vſed ſometimes the hetheniſh ſchooles: & were by* Iulian *the Emperour* h *forbidden both their ſchooles and their books: of malice, becauſe he would not have them learned. As for* Epimenides *the Cretian Prophet, or any Philoſopher, Poet or Preiſt, teaching with humanitie other curious arts or idolatrie: it proveth not that eyther Idolies ſhould be let ſtand, or that other ſhould be pulled downe: neyther doth the equitie of Gods law extend ſo farr. For ſuch houſes, (though idol Preiſts dwelt in them, and taught their idolatrie every day) were not nourriſhments of ſuperſtition, but onely they that dwelt in them. Whereas theſe idol-temples of Antichriſt, in themſelves, and in all the parts & proportion of them*

c Act. 18. 8.

d Act. 19. 27.

e Dan. 1. verſ. 8.

f verſ. 4. &c.

g Act. 18. 4.

h Theodoret. l. 3. c. 8. Sozom. l. 5. c. 18.

of them, are idolatrous, and causes of ſin to many. Even as on the contrary, Gods temple in Iſrael was a nouriſhment of true religion: but the dwelling houſes of the Preiſts *and people, not ſo. And if* Paul *had holden it lawful to vſe idol-temples, as you think you may: Why*
i Act. 19. 27 *took he not occaſion to goe into Dianaes* i *temple in Epheſus, as well as into Tyrannus ſchoole there? ſeing it was lawful for Chriſtians to*
k 1. Cor. 8. 10. *goe into ſuch temples if they would, as ſome* k *in Corinth did. It is not found that there or in any other citie where* Paul *or any other of the Apoſtles came, they ever went to preach in any ſuch place: Who yet took all occaſions to preach to the gentiles, wherſoever they might lawfully. Vnto the Iewes,* Paul *became a Iew: that he might gaine them: and vſually therfore went into their temples and ſynagogues, to preach vnto them: vnto the gentiles alſo, which were without law, he became*
1 1. Cor. 9. 20. 21. *as without law, that he might gaine them: yet we never ſee him to preach in any of their temples or Idolies: though they were ſo common as it is recorded they had* m *as many temples of Gods in Rome, as there were ſepulchres of noble men in the citie.*

m Prudent. l. 1. contr. Symmachum.

Anſwer.

Io. Pa. IN your firſt anſwer vnto that which I ſayd touching the ſchoole of *Tyrannus* converted vnto the ſervice of God, there are divers things to be conſidered: firſt, though yow ſay I *barely affirme and prove not that it was an hetheniſh ſchoole*, yet it ſeemes the very recitall and naming of the words of the Scripture, viz. of *the ſchoole of Tyrannus* was more then a bare affirmation, even by your owne confeſſion in this firſt anſwer, for what needed you to preoccupate the obiectiō that might ariſe from the greek names of *Tyrannus* & his *Schoole*, if there were not ſome appearance of a probable argument to be taken from them? It is an idle thing to prevent obiections, where there is no danger of them.

Secondly, whereas you ſay that *I affirme it was a hetheniſh ſchoole*, this is alſo ſomething more then you might iuſtly affirme: for ſuppoſe that I tooke it to be a Iewiſh ſchoole, yet might I ſay

I ſay as much as I did, viz. *It being as the reſt of the hethenſh ſchooles, &c.* For both the y like phraſe is vſed by the Scriptures, y Eph. 2. 3. when ſpeech is of the Iewes to compare them with *the reſt* of the gentiles, and that the Iewiſh Schooles were nurſeries of ſuperſtition as well as the gentiles it may appeare by that which followeth hereafter.

Thirdly, though there might be (as you obiect) a Iewiſh ſchoole in Epheſus, as there was a Iewes Synagogue, yet this hinders not, but *Tyrannus* his ſchoole might be a hetheniſh ſchoole; vnleſſe you could ſhew that there was but one ſchoole in that city.

Fourthly, you run for help vnto the *great Eagle* of the Iewes (as he is called) and fly vpon his winges, when you tell vs in the name of your doctour *Maimony*, that *by the Hebrew canons they were bound to have ſchooles in every citie and in every country, as wel as ſynagogues.* Herevnto I anſwer, 1. you honour theſe infidel Rabbines too much, when you give vnto their writings the title of *Hebrew canons*, which is a name more fit and agreeable to the canonicall ſcriptures of the old Teſtament, vnto Moſes and the Prophets conteyning the z *canon* or rule of our faith and obe- z Gal. 6. 16 Phil. 3. 16. dience, even as the greek canons may likewiſe denote the ſcriptures of the new Teſtament. The name of the holy ſcriptures ſhould not be given to ſuperſtitious writings, to Iewiſh fables, and to legends of lyes: And beſides, theſe Thalmudicall canons are but carnal weapons; think not with ſuch canons & ordinãce to batter downe our temples. 2. Theſe canons, are many of them the inventions of later Iewes long after Pauls times, and you can not ſhew that the Iewes in the apoſtles dayes were governed by them, how then will you apply this canon alledged by you vnto the queſtion of fact betwixt vs? 3. *Maimony* in the a place alledged recording the canon you ſpeak of, ſaith that a In Thalmud thorah, c. 2. the city which had not a ſchoole Mr. in the ſame, ſhould be anathematized, or curſed, and if they did not repent, that city ſhould be deſtroyed and waſted: And therfore ſuppoſe this canon had bene more ancient then the Apoſtles, yet could it not have

have bene executed in Ephesus the city that we speak of: the cities of the gētiles that had some Iewes dwelling among them, yea or the cities of the Iewes in their owne land being vnder the dominion of the Romanes were not subiect vnto such canons: would the Romanes endure that the cities vnder their government should be wasted and made desolate vpon such pretences? 4, Touching these canons also the Rabbines do contradict one an other: for *R. Iaakob* in b *Arba Turim* shewes that *R. Asher* differs from Maimony in such manner touching the number of schollers and schoolemaisters to be imployed about them in ech citie, that if we were as credulous as the Iewes in regarding these forged canons yet could we have no certainty therein. 5. Suppose there were such ancient canons binding the Iewes in Ephesus to have a schoole among them, yet that doth not hinder but that the schoole of *Tyrannus* might be a hethenish schoole also. 6. If you will have the testimonies of men to be produced in these controversies, are we not much more to regard the writings of learned Christians, then of these impious Iewes, infamous as well for their fables, as for their infidelity & hatred of Christe? And the c Christian writers of the Ecclesiasticall history do expressely note this place to have bene an hethenish Schoole.

b Lib. Iore degnah, tract. Thalmud thorah signo. 245.

c Magdeburgenses cent. 1. l. 2. cap. 7. de scholis. col. 516.

Fiftly, whereas you say; *Neither doth the School-maisters Greek name Tyrannus hinder, but he might be a Iew, &c.* I answer, 1. Though I deny not but some Iewes had Greek names, as divers of the Apostles themselves besides sundry others: yet considering that ordinarily Iewes were called by Hebrew names & Greekes by Greek names, and so men of other nations likewise, if things be equally weighed [*cæteris paribus*,] when there is no other particular testimonie or determination touching any person to shew what nation he is of, as there is not here for *Tyrannus*: then in all reason the name of such a man should lead vs vnto such a nation where his name is most ordinarily vsed: as the name of *Pharaoh* vnto an Egyptian: the name of *Agag* to an Amalekite: and the name of *Tyrannus* to a Greek.

Yea

Yea thus the holy Ghost purposely vset to distinguish & poynt out vnto vs speciall countries, times, places & offices of men by vsing a word of different language in those bookes of holy scripture which were written in an other tongue: as for example, *Esay* writing in Hebrew touching the ruine of Babel vseth a d Chaldæan word to signify the overthrow of the Chaldean Monarchy; *Ieremy* in his Hebrew Prophecy against Babel vseth a e Babylonian word to note the very time of their fall, as they should be in the middes of their feasting: The Apostle writing in Greek of the judgement hall where Christ was condemned vseth a f Romane or latine word shewing the Romane authority that was exercised in that place: and so the Evangelist in his Greek story vseth a g Romane word for a Romane officer: And so the Syriaque Translatout in this place *Act. 19. 9* vse the Greek word for a Schoole, all the rest being Syriaque might hereby most fitly note vnto vs a Greek schoole of the gentiles: as the Greek name of *Tyrannus* to shew a Greek Schoolemaister: there being no other proofe to the contrary, to præponderate this apparant reason. 2, it is also a great vncertainty and not proved of you by any instance, when as you affirme, that *in Rom. 16. Iewes had names both Greek and Latine*: As for *Aquila* the Iew, *vers. 3.* Drusius h shewes you how his name comes plainely and directly from an vsuall Hebrew word: As for the kinsmen of Paul, mentioned vers. 7. 11. 21. it is vncertaine whether they were Iewes or proselytes, which might be his kinsmen though they were Romanes or Greekes: As for any other mētioned in that place you have lesse colour to affirme that they were Iewes having Greek and Latine names. 3, you say that *Turnus or Tyrannus is a name mentioned of the Hebrew doctours*: but you do not shew that he is mentioned as a Iew; the Rabbines mention the names of sundry gentiles in their writings: & *Turnus* Rophus or *Rufus* that is mentioned in the i *Thalmud*, is not sayd to be a Iew: Such kinde of their menrioning this name is against you, and leads vs to think *Tyrannus* should be a gentile rather then a Iew: but if an

d Madhebah Esa. 14 4.

e Shesshach Ier. 25. 26. & 51. 41.

f Prætorium Ioh. 18. 28

g Centurio Mark. 15. 39. 44 45.

h Præteritorū lib. 5. in Act. 18. 2

i In Sanhedrim. c. 7. fol. 65. & in Babba bathra, c. 1. fol. 10.

other *Tyrannus* in any Rabbine be nominated for a Iew, yet this hinders not but this *Tyrannus* in Act. 19. should rather be taken for a gentile, there being no determination of his person contrary to his name, ordinarily given to a Greek. 4, you alledge, that *Tyrannus might favour the trueth as well as Crispus and Sosthenes rulers of the synagogue:* but what meane you by this cõpariſon? whether *Crispus and Sosthenes* were Iewes or proſelytes it is vncertaine, that *Tyrannus* whether Iew or gẽtile might favour the truth, we doubt not: but how this should confirme your opinion, it appeares not.

In your second answer touching the schoole of *Tyrannus*, first you say, *if it were an hetheniſh ſchoole, yet you deny that it was an Idolie, or place devote to deſtruction by the law in Deut. 12, &c.* But herein you do first contradict yourself: for [k] before in your reply vnto the sixt answer which I gave vnto your first reason, you sayd and vrged this, that *the Law speaketh of all places where in the nations served their gods: so that though they were not for ſacrifice, but for prayer or other like vſe they were to be pulled downe.* Now, that the hetheniſh Gods were served in these Idolatrous schooles, by schoolemaisters it is manifest out of that [l] Author whom yourself sometime produce for a witnesse, who shewes that *the Schoolemaiſters did preach the Gods of the nations & declare their names, their genealogies, fables and other honourable ornaments and obſerve their feaſts, &c. that the firſt ſchoole-hyre of the new ſcholler was conſecrated to the name and honour of Minerva.* That Idolothyte was called *Minerval.* This Idol-service of the heathniſh schooles he shewes at large as *by Catechizing touching Idolles*, so by divers other services. And therfore the Gods of the nations being served there, it followes by your former grant contrary to this later denyall that such schooles ought to be pulled downe as places devote vnto destruction. 2. You do here seeme to make an Idolie or place devote to destruction to be the same thing, but this errour is [m] before reproved: And when you labour to shew that hetheniſh schooles are not to be pulled downe, you confirme that which I say in my argu-

k pag. 165.

l Tertullia. de Idololat. cap. 10.

m pag. 220. 221.

argument against you.

Secondly, you say, *this is called the ſchoole of Tyrannus a man & not the ſchoole of Iupiter, Apollo or any hethen God, &c.* Answer. 1 It is Idol-service by your owne grant from Deut. 12. that makes a place subiect to destruction; and therfore the want of an Idol-name could not in such case save or deliver the polluted place from destruction. 2, as [n] Idolaters have bene ready to performe divine worship vnto living men many wayes: so also by this that they have built temples, altars, images to their honour: Thus, to omit many other examples that might be noted, one of your owne Authors whom yourself alledge for your witnesse [o] doth testify of *Herod*, that he built not onely a citie, but a temple vnto *Cæsar*, to the worship and honour of his name: And according to your reasoning, such Idolies might be thus excused, that these were called the temples of *Cæsar* a man, and not the temple of *Iupiter, Apolle*, &c.

n Dan. 6. 7. Act. 14. 11. Rev. 13. 4.

o Ioseph. Antiq. Iudaic. lib. 15. c. 12, 13.

Thirdly, you say, *Daniel also and his brethren (who ſtrictly kept Moſes ordinances) refuſed not the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans, among whom Idolatrie was taught, as among other hethens.* I answer, 1. *Daniel* and his fellowes might be instructed in the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans though they did not frequent the schooles or temples where Idolatry was publiquely taught: And seing *Daniel* was so carefull to keep himself from pollution with vncleane meate we are bound to judge that he wanted not care to preserve his soule from the vncleane foode of Idolatrous doctrines taught in their schooles: And the [p] great favour which he had with their overseers may perswade that he found favour in this poynt as well as in the former. 2, your [q] Iew doctours interpret this learning of the Chaldeans which *Daniel* refused not, to be the writing and language of the Chaldeans: Now this might easily have bene learned by *Daniel* of some godly and faithfull Iewes, though he had nothing at all to do with Chaldeans themselves: there being ordinarily enough of one nation that can speak and write in the language of an other nation. 3, though we grant that *Daniel* might learne

p Dan. 1. 9.

q R. Saadias, & R. Abraham Abē Ezra, Cõment. on Dan. 1. 4

of the Chaldeans themſelves, not onely, to ſpeak, read and write their language, but alſo other lawfull and liberall ſciences: yet this vvas to be done with caution of not learning their Idolatries and curious arts, vvhich were [r] vnlavvfull to be taught or learned: And this might the better be done, conſidering there were ſo many ſects among the *Chaldeans*, of vvhich ſome attended vnto more lavvfull ſtudies and as [s] hiſtorians vvrite, did condemne and reiect the curious arts of the reſt. 4, See vvhat ſtrange extremities you run into: You that condemne and forſake the true ſervice of God in the Reformed Churches, in any temple formerly abuſed vnto Idolatry, do yet here allovv communion vvith Idolaters even in Idol-ſervice by hearing & liſtning vnto Idolatrous doctrines taught in their heathniſh ſchooles vvhich vvere publique Idol-houſes: yea you that condemne all religious communion both publique and private vvith the Godlieſt Chriſtians in the Church of England, & hold it vnlavvfull to heare even a private lecture of divinity from any miniſter of that Church, though no errour at all ſhould be taught in the ſame, are not yet afraid to iuſtify the hearing of a lecture of philoſophy and Idolatry mixed togather, & this from the Chaldæan Miniſters or Prophets even in Babylon it ſelf. oh how is your conſcience benummed?

[r] Deut. 18. 10.—14.

[s] Strabo geograph. lib. 16.

Fourthly, you ſay further, *neither vvas there any ſuch converſion of this ſchoole to the ſervice of God as I mētion, &c.* I Anſwer, 1. your reaſon to prove that it continued a ſchoole ſtill is inſufficient: for though it be ſayd that Paul diſputed dayly in the ſchoole of *Tyrannus*, this kinde of ſpeech doth no more prove that it continued a ſchoole ſtill, then the ſpeech of the Apoſtle ſaying of Antichriſt that he [t] *ſits in the Temple of God*, doth prove that the Church of Rome doth ſtill cōtinue the Temple of God; do you not knovv that many places reteyne their old names, though the vſe of them be changed, and they couverted vnto other ſervices? your bold affirmation that it continued a ſchoole ſtill is very vnvvarrantable. 2. Though I affirmed not, that it ceaſed to be a ſchoole of humane learning, yet is it moſt probable that it vvas

[t] 2. Theſ. 2. 4.

it vvas no longer ſuch a ſchoole: for hovv could it conveniently ſerve for both vſes? It is ſayd that Paul [u] *diſputed* there and that *dayly*: ſuch kinde of diſputes might often times require the greateſt part of the day: and ſometimes in vv other places ſuch exerciſes continued *from morning to night*. It is ſayd that Paul continued this exerciſe there [x] *by the ſpace of two yeares ſo that all they which dvvelt in Aſia heard the vvord of the Lord Ieſus, both Ievves & Grecians*. This continuance in the place vvith ſuch fame, could not but encreaſe his auditors, and his employment and conſequently decreaſe the opportunity of employing that place vnto an other vſe. It is noted further what [y] *great miracles God vvrought by the hand of Paul* during this time, and what confluence of people ſuch miracles vvrought, appeares in other places where vpon like occaſion, [z] *millions of people gathered together*, & thronged to heare and ſee: vpon ſuch occaſion there were ſo a *many commers and goers* vnto Chriſte and his diſciples, *that they had no leaſure to eat bread*; And vvhen he withdrew himſelf into the vvildernes to reſt a while, the people perceyving it, rā a foote thither out of all cities, and came thither and aſſembled vnto him, &c. And here being now the like occaſion of concurſe, vvhat reaſon is there to think that there ſhould be liberty & opportunity to keep an other ſchoole in this place, vvhere in all appearāce the time did hardly ſuffice for the diſciples vvhich came to be enſtructed of Paul in this ſchoole of Chriſtianity? And this inconvenience for an other ſchoole in this place may further be diſcerned of you, if according to your allegation before, the Thalmudique canons are to be applyed vnto the ſchooles in this time; for thoſe canons require touching the Iewiſh ſchooles, that [b] *the ſcheole Mr. muſt ſit and teach the children all the vvhole day & part of the night, ſo as he may enſtruct & teach them day and night; that they ceaſe not at all, except in the evenings of the Sabaths, & in the evenings of the good dayes, in the end of thoſe dayes: that on the ſabaths they may not begin a nevv leſſon, but may cauſe the children to repeat that vvhich they have learned before, &c. That the ſchoole Mr. vvhich lets the children reſt & goes forth or vvhich doth an other*

[u] Act. 19. 9

[v] Act. 28. 23.

[x] Act. 19. 10

[y] Ibid verſ. 11, 12. &c

[z] Luk. 12. 1

[a] Mark, 6. 31. 33.

[b] Arba Turim, lib. Ior. dea, Tract. That mud thorah, figno 245. Maymony in miſneh, tract. Thalmud thorah cap. 2. ſect. 2. & 3

other Work with them, or which is idle, is altogether accurſed for doing the Work of the Lord negligently, &c. How could theſe canons poſſibly be obſerved, to teach children night and day, in that place, where Paul diſputed dayly with ſuch concourſe of people? 3. Suppoſe that heatheniſh ſchooles being Idolies, and that this ſchoole being ſuch an one, was ſtill reteyned for a ſchoole, yet doth it not follow as you would inferre *that Idol-Temples may be vſed vnto the ſervice of God, whiles the Idol-ſervice is continued alſo in them:* For if we ſhould grant vnto you that it ſtill continued a ſchoole, yet then any reaſonable man would grant vnto me withall, that it was reformed by *Paul* that the curious arts and Idolatrie were no more taught in the ſame, but onely ſuch humane learning as was of lawfull and good vſe; and thus the Idol-ſervice being aboliſhed both it & other ſuch like places might then lawfully be vſed vnto the ſervice of God.

4. VVhereas you plead further that *both Iewes and Greeks heard Paul there diſputing, &c.* that *the Iewes held it vnlawful to come into an Idol Temple, &c.* This latter clawſe is affirmed but not confirmed by you: how prove you that the Iewes being vnder Moſes politie held it vnlawfull to come into an Idol Temple, when the Idolatry was remooved, eſpecialy being out of *Canaan*, as this place in *Epheſus* was?

Fiftly you alledge, that *in ages following, Chriſtians who altogither refuſed communion with the hethens in their Idolies and ſacrifices; yet vſed ſometimes the heatheniſh ſchooles: and were by Iulian the Emperour forbidden both their ſchooles and bookes; of malice, becauſe he would not have them learned.* Herevnto I anſwer, 1. That heatheniſh ſchooles were ſometimes lawfully vſed by Chriſtians when as the heatheniſh Idolatry was no lōger taught in them, is the thing that I plead for; and this ſerves moſt evidently to overthrow your errour that deny Chriſtians the vſe of other places abuſed vnto Idolatry, even after that Idolatry is no longer taught in them. 2. If Chriſtians did ſometimes vſe the heatheniſh ſchooles even while their Idolatry was ſtill taught in them, this example hath no warrant from Gods word: and

and we ſee that the Chriſtians in thoſe ages that you ſpeak of, did ſometimes pollute themſelves with Idols, eſpecially with their [d] ſuperſtitious vſe of the ſigne of the croſſe, &c. Their example in vſing ſuch places as were polluted with publique & ordinary Idol-ſervice, doth not hinder but that thoſe places are to be eſteemed Idolies. 3, though *Iulian* of malice might forbid the heatheniſh ſchooles and bookes vnto Chriſtians, yet might the Lord in mercy vſe the malice of that Emperour as [e] *a thorne to ſtop the way of his people and as a hedge* to preſerve them from the entiſements of Idolaters, to whom all ages are too prone to hearken. whereas the Lord requires that children ſhould be initiated or [f] *conſecrate* betimes in a good way, how dangerous a thing was it to ſeek their conſecration from Idolatrous ſchoole Mrs, & to ſuffer their children to communicate with them in their heatheniſh lore, where (as one cōplaines, and not without cauſe) [g] *the firſt faith is edifyed vnto the divel from the beginnings of their learning*; where (as others [h] record) theſe heatheniſh ſchoolemaiſters did ſometimes teach their ſchollers blaſphemous leſſons cōpoſed of purpoſe againſt Chriſte Ieſus. 4. Do not you your ſelf note it for a tranſgreſſion of the ſecond comandement, to [i] *read the bookes of them that be teachers of Idolatry*? And is there any caſe of reading ſuch books more dangerous, then when children in their tender age ſhall read them, & this in heatheniſh ſchooles, among hethens, where Idolatrous ſchoolemaiſters ſhall commend the Idols & Idol ſervice vnto them? In theſe your different writings, you are like vnto the [k] fountaine that ſends forth ſweet and bitter. 5. You [l] tell vs out of *Maimony*, that *Idolaters have made many bookes of their ſervice, and of the works and rites of the ſame: that the holy bleſſed God hath commanded vs, that we ſhould not at all read in thoſe bookes.* And I may againe tell you out of *Maimony* from his owne confeſſion in an other place, that he himſelf did not obſerve this comandment, but doth often [m] alledge the bookes of the Idol-Prophets, and repeats many fables out of the ſame, & notes their Idolatrous opinions, and ſayth: *The knowledge of thoſe opinions*

[d] Tertul. de corona militis cap. 3.

[e] Hoſ. 2. 6.

[f] Prov. 22. 6.

[g] Tertul. de Idololat. cap. 10.

[h] Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. 9. c. 5. & 7.

[i] Annot. on Exo 20. 5.

[k] Iam. 3. 11.

[l] Annot. on Exo. 20. 5.

[m] Maimo. in Moreh Nebuchim, chel 3. per. 30. & 31.

opinions and workes is a great Dore, through which may be drawne forth reasons and causes of the comandments; seing the foundation and pillier of the whole law whereupon it resteth is to blot out those opinions from the hearts of men, &c. Thus in regard of necessary helpe which he alledgeth in this place he was content to reteyne the vse of such bookes which he did so peremptorily condemne before; And except you defend your self with the like regard of necessary vse, you wil also be found a transgressour of the second comandment, condēned even of your owne mouth for reading the most Idolatrous bookes, that are extant at this day, as appeares by your manifold allegations of them. And then further, if you will reteyne the most Idolatrous bookes, in regard of *necessary vse*, how can you then condemne vs that for *necessary vse* do likewise reteyne our Temples though formerly abused vnto Idolatry? yea if we compare these two things together, it is most evident, that Idolatrous books are far stronger nourishments of superstition and entisements vnto Idolatry, then are our temples: The shape of our Churches doth not deceive as do the subtill persuasions of false teachers in their writings, continuall experience witnesseth and proclaymeth the same vnto vs. And if your eares were not stopt with preiudice against the truth, this alone consideration might serve to convince your errour touching our Temples.

Sixthly, *as for Epimenides the Cretian Prophet or any other Philosopher, Poët or Priest teaching with humanitie other curious arts or Idolatrie, &c.* It is to be observed, 1. Seing the publique teaching of Idolatrie and invocation of false Gods vsed by such Poets, Prophets or Priests are parts of Religious worship and service, seing your self confesse in this writing here before noted, as also in n other of your writings that all the places where such Idolaters, *served their Gods*, were to be destroyed; if your doctrine were sound it would follow hereupon that all such hethenish schooles, were to be destroyed as well as any other Temples.

n Counterpoy. p. 199

2. If your sixt argument were sound, *viz*, that our temples are to be destroyed *because they nourish superstition*, as you say, then will

will it hence follow also, that the Schoole of *Tyrannus*, suppose it were a Iewish schoole, was yet to have bene destroyed in like maner because the Iewish schooles were o nurseries of superstition, where vaine inventiōs and traditions of men were taught. And if after your example we might alledge the Thalmudique canons, and apply them as you do vnto the schoole in questiō, then would it be far more evident, that the Iewish Schooles were in a high degree nurseries of superstitiō; for the Rabbines shewing how Children are to be taught, have this rule of education among them, p *Bar schith, lemikra: Bar gnasar lemischneh: Bar teresar, letagnanitha*, that is: *A childe of six* yeares, *to the scripture: a childe of ten, to the Thalmud: a childe of twelve, to fasting:* And againe, in an other place: q *R. Saphra, in the name of R. Iehoshua the sonne of Hananiah saith: What is that which is written, Thou shalt rehearse them to thy Children? Read not*, Schinnantem, *thou shalt rehearse them*, but Schillatchiem, *thou shalt divide them into three parts: for ever shall a man divide his yeares into three parts: a third part, to the scripture: a third part to the Gemara,* (which is one maine part of the Thalmud) *a third part, to mischneh:* which is the other maine part of the Thalmud: So that by these canons and testimonies of the Rabbines the Children in the Iewish schooles were fed with the milk of superstition, and loaden with traditions in learning the Thalmud, the grand forge of superstition: and twise so much paines they were to bestow therein, as they did in the scriptures: And therfore according to your arguing these schooles were to be destroyed, for nourishing of superstition.

o Act. 21.3. 4. with Act. 26.5. 5. & phil. 3.5.6

p Thalmud, tractat. cethuboth, c. 4. fol. 50.

q Thalmud tract. Kidduschim, c. 1. fol. 30.

Seventhly, where as you say of the Idolatrous schooles, that *such houses (though Idol-Preists dwelt in them, and taught Idolatry every day) were not nourishments of superstition, but onely they that dwelt in them. Whereas these Idol-temples of Antichrist, in themselves, and in all the parts and proportion of them are Idolatrous and causes of sin to many, &c.* I reply, 1. If this distinction be good, how will you prove that the Canaanitish Idol-temples were nourishments of superstition and to be destroyed in that

regard? How can you say that they were in their shape, proportion and parts Idolatrous? The scripture shewes not the forme of them, nor yet any mysteries or sacred significations noted therein. VVe have no testimony touching the superstitious frame and structure of the house of Dagon, of Baal, or of Ieroboams temples: And therfore according to your distinction in this place they were no nourishments of superstition, but onely those that dwelt or taught Idolatry in them: so that if the Altars, images and false worship had bene remooved, they mought even vnder Moses have bene converted vnto the service of the Lord. 2. I have shewed before that our temples, and especially that wherein we meet togather, and about which our question is, doth not consist of such a superstitious structure and fabrick as you pretend: yea it is manifest in experiẽce and manifold instances might be given of sundry private houses which for the situation and three parts before noted by you, are liker vnto Solomons temple then ours is: and consequently to be rather destroyed as being idolatrous shrines. 3, if our temples in respect of their forme, proportion and parts be nourishments of superstition, and therfore to be avoyded; then are you as guilty in comming vnto them as we: for whether you come for your study, or whether some of your people come for the almes distributed there: the visible shape and proportion of these temples in the forme of their building doth as much present itself vnto your eyes coming thither to serve your selves: as vnto our eyes when we come thither to serve the Lord. The outward shape of the Church may as well affect & ensnare him that walketh vp and downe therein for his pleasure or proffit: as him that sitteth there to heare the word of God for his edification: so that if there be any weight in this pretence, it then lights vpon your owne head. 4, how know you also but that the heathnish schooles might have a superstitious structure as well as temples: and that some mysticall significations might be imputed or ascribed vnto some parts thereof? and what then shall become of your distinction, where by

by you imagine and feigne such a difference betwixt our temples and those publique Schooles? 5. That which you speak by way of comparison with the temple touching *the dwelling houses of the Preists and people*, is both vnequally and vnfitly applyed vnto the controversie in this place, seing I spake here of the publique places and schooles where the heathnish prophets or Poets did ordinarily and openly teach idolatrie, and not of their private houses: and besides that, it is but a bare and false assertion which you vtter of their private houses: seing they also may justly receive a denomination of the workes performed in them whether good or evill.

Lastly, you obiect, *if Paul, had holden it lawfull to vse idol Temples as we think we may; why took he not occasion to go into Dianaes temple in Ephesus, as wel as into Tyrannus schoole there, &c.* Ianswer, 1. there is manifest reason for this, seing *Dianaes* temple vvas still reteyned for Idolatrous vse, as may be observed from ther text; but that it vvas so vvith *Tyrannus* his schoole, the text shevveth not at all; but the contrary is playne by the *dayly* vse vvhich it vvas put vnto. 2. VVhere you say, *it was lawfull for Christians to go into such temples, if they would, as some in Corinth did*: though I deny not but that in some cases of necessitie this is lavvfull, yet doth not your allegatiõ frõ *1. Cor. 8. 10.* prove the same; for neither, may the vvord *Idolie* there vsed be restreyned vnto an Idols temple, though it be commonly so translated in that place: it signifyes a place of Idols, though there be no building over them, though they stand in opẽ places, in mountaines, or vallies, in streets and in market places, in bathes, &c. as oftentimes the Idols vvere vvont to do. In such open places might a vveak Christian in Corinth see many sitting at an Idols table: yea he might also discerne & see some sitting in a temple vvithout entring into the same: & further, if Paul had shevved that some weake Christians in *Corinth* had entred into the very temples, yet is not a simple narration of such a fact, any iustification thereof, to prove that it might lavvfully be done, as you seeme to plead. 3. VVhere you say also, *It is not found that*

r Act. 19. 28.—35.

s Tertullia. de spectaculis. cap. 8

there or in any other citie where Paul or any other of the Apostles came, they ever went to preach in any such place, &c. And againe, *yet we never see him to preach in any of their temples or idolies, &c.* This is a very vveak pretense, for vvhat though it be not found; and vvhat though vve never see it? vvill you reason thus negatively from the scripture? *It is not found* in the scriptures, in vvhat cities, nor so much as in vvhat countries some of the Apostles did preach, much lesse in vvhat temples. Also it is not found in the scriptures that ever Paul or any other of the Apostles did refuse to preach in such places purged from Idolatry. 4. It is very probable, that Paul did preach in the Idolie or Idol-place at Athens: for seing as I noted before, it was the manner of the heathens, to make their streets and market places to be Idolies; seing *Athens* is t recorded to have far exceeded the other cities of *Græcia* in store of Idoles and Idolatrie: seing Luke u records how Paul passing by did see their Altars & superstition: and being stirred in spirit, did therevpon in the market dayly dispute with whomsoever he met, as wel as in the Synagogue with the Iewes: we have therfore reason to think that Paul did preach Iesus in their Idolie or market place. It seemes also that the man of God which came out of Iudah did preach in the w Idolie of *Bethel*, (whether it was a temple or an other open place it is vncertaine,) when as he denounced the wrath of God against *Ieroboams* Idolatrie. Thus *Ieremie* also x preached in the vallie of *Benhinnom*, the Idolie of *Moloch*. And thus vpon like occasion and like necessary vse, it may still be lawfull to preach in an Idol-temple in like manner, to protest against the Idolatry that is for the instant practised therein.

5. As for the testimony of *Prudentius* recording that *they had as many temples of Gods in Rome, as there were sepulchres of noble men in this citie*, this makes against your self: for if there were so many temples and Idolies in Roome now in *Prudentius* his time when he wrote this (for that which he saith, he affirmes for the time present) then this overthrowes your former allegation out of *Theodoret* concerning all the temples destroyed vnder *Theodosius*

s Pausanias & Xenophon, citante Beza in Act. 17. 16.

t Act. 17. 16, 17, 18. u Act. 17. 23.

w 1. Kin. 13. 1.

x Ier. 19. 2. with Ier. 7. 31.

This

This record of *Prudentius* being given y after the death of *Theodosius*. And againe if according to your plea, Paul might not preach in any of those places where the noble men had bene buryed in Rome, they being all defiled with Idolatry: then do you hereby againe incurre the danger of that consequence which brings with it the destruction of private Idolies or houses abused vnto Idolatrie, as well as of publique temples: for how know you that this multitude of noble mens sepulchres were all publique, and that some of them were not in their private houses?

y Magdeburgens. cent. 4. c. 10. Col. 1179. 1180.

Section. 7.

VNto our 5. allegation, from the leprous garments compared with the Apostles doctrine, Iude v. 23. warning us to hate even the garment spotted of the flesh, and consequently to hate the houses of Antichrist which are not onely defiled with idols, but are idols themselves: you say nothing hereto, but take occasion from an other place to speak againe of Gods indulgence for some things of necessary use, whereof there is ynough sayd before, and I shal leave it vnto iudgement. Hen. Ainſ.

You here lay sore blame vpon me, for that in shewing out of the pontifical the popish manner of Ordination, I set it down with crosses, as it is printed in that book before. You say, I erect them a new, and set them up for religious use, &c. Wherto I answer, Howsoever you aggravate this thing, the most that you can truly say, is that I seek to pull them downe frō religious vse after an unlawful manner, if so it be found: but let us weigh your reasons. The 1. is, that a Papist seing them, may come to blesse an idol in his hart, or adore one of them that he seeth. And so (say I) when he seeth or heareth the name of S^t. Peter, or any other S^t, or of a crosse or crucifix, he may haply come to blesse an idol in his hart, and with his mouth too: shal they not therfore be spoken of, or written? 2. Therfore you say, this divised kinde of instruction hath no warrant from God, and so the syn comes on the instructours head. Your reason is, for that God in his word causeth not the shapes or figures of idols to be pourtrayed, whē he nameth

Chemosh, Moloch, &c. therfore there is no excuse left for me herein. I answer, neyther doth God in his word, set down any figure of his Tabernacle, Ark, Temple, or of any man, beast, or other creature, or mapp of any countrie: is it not therfore lawfull in private books to pourtray any of these? If it be, then your reason from a deuised kinde of instruction without warrant from God, wilbe litle worth in this "case. But whereas you say, that I neglecting the examples of all the "Churches of Christ in that which is good, doe folow a few in that errour which I would seem most to condemne: I wil therfore leave it to the iudgement of the Churches of God, and strive no more. For be it that I have offended herein, (as I confesse I syn many other wayes, and so may in this though I see it not) yet is there no help to your cause therby at all. For, to iustifie evil because an other man doeth the like, is but a sorie plea.

Answer.

To. Pa. VNto your allegation of Levit. 13. & 14. Chap. with Iude 23 I sayd the lesse because I supposed you did not direct the same against our temples, but against the garments mentioned also in the same place of your Apologie: yet had you well regarded mine answer, you might have found sufficient therein, to shew you that there is no consequence from the burning of an vnproffitable leprous garment, to the abolishing of our temples. I alledged divers z scriptures vnto you, teaching that God allowes the reteyning of such things as are of more proffitable vse, though they have bene formerly polluted: The a earthen vessell being polluted was to be broken; but the vessell of wood or brasse was to be rinsed and scowred onely, and then made lawful for vse againe. And is there not as much difference betwixt our temples and a rag: as there is betwixt an earthen and a woodden vessel? To these scriptures you say nothing. I shewed b before that the goodnes and bountifullnes of the Lorde towards his people was to be discerned herein: but you despise the bountifullnes of the Lord and will have his benefit to be reiected.

z Lev. 11. 32. 33. & 68.

a Lev. 15. 12

b Pag. 214 & 250. 251

reiected. Your complaint against all you write against, is that they bring not scripture: but when it is brought, we see that you are willing enough to passe by it sometimes, as if it had not bene brought at all. You say that touching things of necessary vse, there is ynough sayd before: but touching this new reason from the scripture, nothing was sayd before: and that which you have sayd before for the rest is shewed to be insufficient. Yourself do often alledge one and the same scripture six or seven times over: And must we so often give answer vnto your allegations, vvhiles you give no answer at all vnto some of ours? But for the vveight thereof, I am content to leave them vnto the iudgement of the reader.

Touching the grand Idol, erected by your self, pourtrayed & printed in your booke, these are the things which I commend vnto your consideration, 1. You do therfore deserve the *forer blame* to be layd vpon you, for setting vp this Idol, because your self do so vniustly labour to bring the blame of so hainous Idolatry vpon all the Churches of God: and you should not complaine (as you do) that this thing is *aggravated* against you, because the sight of your errour herein may be a meanes to bring you vnto some feeling of your self and of your rash iudgement. 2. Your fault hath not bene so aggravated against you, but that it may yet be shewed to be far greater, for though it be great in ech of the respects which c before I shewed, because without any necessary vse, you do a new erect, not a monument onely, but a very Idol, and a principall Idoll of Antichriste, even the Idol of the crosse, though in your answer you have not bene able to deny any one of these respects: yet your offence in setting vp this Idol is by far the more haynous and notorious in respect of the place, where you have set it. The settle or shrine wherevpon you have placed this Idol, is the name of God, even of the most holy Trinitie, as appeares in your printed d book, where you have affixed the idol-crosse vnto the name of ech person in the Trinity, even as it is done in the idolatrous pontificall: And thus you do most vnworthily abuse the name of God,

c Pag. 24. 25

d Animad. vers. pag. 64

God, in making it a foote-ſtoole for a moſt filthy idol to ſtand on and tread vpon the ſame. VVhen the hetheniſh Idols or gods that could not cary them ſelves, were e caryed vpon the bunches of the camelles or vpon the backs of other beaſts that bowed and fell downe vnder the burden, it was folly to be laughed at and ſin to be condemned; but to ſet the moſt abominable idol vpon the back of the moſt holy and pure God; this is a ſin of greater indignity to be abhorred and trembled at. It is odious to ſee the pope that great beaſt caried vpō the ſhoulders of men; but that the popes Idol-croſſe ſhould ride vpon the ſhoulders of the holy Trinitie, as in a chariot of Triumph, as in your book you have made it, this is far more odious and deteſtable. The ſin of *Solomon* was greater in reſpect of the place where he ſet vp Idols, even f in the *mountaine that is over againſt Ieruſalem*: The ſin of *Manaſſes* was yet greater in reſpect of the place where he ſet vp Idols, even g *in the houſe of God*: but if he had placed an Idol in the oracle, in the moſt holy place, even vpon the Mercy-ſeate over the ark, this had bene more horrible: And if yet further he had placed there betvvixt the Cherubims the moſt vile Idol, even *Beelzebub the Prince of the devilles*, this had bene out of meaſure ſinfull and impious above the reſt: And yet even this is the ſin vvhich you ignorantly run into, vvhile yourſelf do confeſſe the image of the Croſſe to be h *Beelzebub Prince of the Devilles*, & yet place it over the ark, even vpon the Glorious and fearful name of the Holy Trinitie: You that ſo raſhly blame all the Churches of Chriſt for their vſe of temples formerly polluted vvith Idolatrie, have not feared to make the name of God an Idol-temple, vvhere to this day the Idol-ſtands ſtill: vvere your bookes as much vvorth as the Epheſians Act. 19. you ſhould do vvell to burne them all, that are yet in your hands, for a teſtimonie of your repentance. And for ſo much as you have condemned the Church of Rome, for imprinting the very ſame Idol of the croſſe not onely in their Churches and houſes, but alſo i *in their bookes and vvritings*; aboliſh your ovvne book and vvriting vvherein you have cauſed it to

e Eſa. 45. 1, 2.

f 1. Kin. 11 7.

g 2. Kin. 21 4. 5. 7.

h Arrow againſt Idolat. cap. 5. ſect. 13.

i Ibidem.

it to be imprinted. 3, whereas you plead, *the moſt that I can truely ſay, is that you ſeek to pull them downe from religious vſe after an vnlawfull maner, &c.* I am indeed willing to judge the beſt of you, and think that your entent and meaning was to doe God good ſervice, (as I wrote before) in *teaching men the evill of* Idolatry. But the beſt that we can judge hereof is evill enough: we ſee many Authors of playes and comedies do ſet forth ſuch enterludes with intent to pluck downe vice, but doing the ſame without any warrant of Gods word, & vſing ſuch a kinde of inſtruction as God never appoynted: they do ſtrengthen the vices & wickednes which they would reprove. And what is the maine breach of the ſecond cōmandemēt but the ſerving of God *after an vnlawful maner*? Therfore when you ſee yourſelf cōvicted of this *vnlawfull maner* by ſetting vp an Idol, & making the name of God an Idolie for the ſame, your evill therein may be great enough though there be no more then that. 4, In ſetting downe your anſwer to my reaſon againſt your Idol, you deale deceitfully, and vſe a fallacie *ab iniquâ diviſione*, dividing that reaſon in to two, which was but one. The ſumme of it was: that ſuch kinde of inſtruction as did occaſion men to ſtumble, to bleſſe an Idol in their hearts, and to worſhip the ſame, and withall was a deviſed kinde of inſtruction without warrant of Gods word, that was vnlawfull. The latter part of this reaſon I ſet downe by way of preoccupacion, to prevent thoſe vaine anſwers, which yet you have made vnto it: as may be ſeene in my k former writing. This reaſon being taken thus together, your anſwers do both vaniſh preſently: for that which you anſwer firſt of men being offended and brought to bleſs an Idol, *by ſeing or hearing the name of a croſſe or crucifix*, is cut of by the ſecond part of my reaſon: becauſe there is warrant in the ſcripture to write or pronounce the name of an Idol, but not to picture them for religious vſe, as you have done the croſſe: That which you anſwer in the ſecond place touching *the tabernacle, ark, temple, and ſuch like things deſcribed in mappes*, is cut of by the firſt part of my reaſon: becauſe theſe figures and deſcriptions

k Pag. 2.

are not Idolatrous and ſcandalous as is the paynting of Idols & images for religious vſe. That you may more plainely ſee how vnequally and vnreaſonably you match theſe things together, which are ſo vnlike: do but conſider, that in the deſcription of carnall adultery & vncleannes, it would be a ſinfull and ſcandalous thing to picture many ſtories in ſuch maner, as they are recorded to have bene done in the ſcriptures: as for example, to paynt *Bathſheba* as ſhe was [l] ſeene of David, & defiled of *David*, to pourtray the images of [m] *Iudah* & *Thamar*: of [n] *Amnon* & *Thamar*, & of divers others as they are deſcribed in the word of God. You acknowledge, I doubt not but that their ſin is great which make ſuch offenſive pictures, [o] occaſions of luſt. And if the naked pictures of carnall adultereſſes be vnlawfull, then are the pictures of ſpirituall whoredom in the caſe of offence vnlawfull alſo. And who ſees not the great difference betwixt theſe vncleane ſcandalous pictures, and the mappes of countries or figures of the temple and ſuch like things as you ſpeake of? 5, of the 7. reaſons which you bring againſt our vſe of temples, though they be all inſufficient againſt vs: yet there are 5 of them that do condemne this vnneceſſary vſe of the Idol-croſſe erected in your booke; namely, the firſt, ſecond, fift, ſixt and ſeventh which ſerve to reprove the Idols and monuments of Idolatry, whereof there is no proffit to the Church of God. 6, whereas you ſeek to diminiſh your fault, by aſking whether it be not *lawfull in private bookes to pourtray any of, &c.* You wāder far from the matter, and do ill apply this demand to the queſtion in hand: for who ſees not that your printed booke wherein this Idol ſtands is a publique writing, publiſhed vnto the world, and to the eyes of all that can read? yea herein you reprove yourſelf, in that in your [p] former writing you do twiſe or thriſe call your printed bookes your *proofes in publique*: *reaſons ſet forth in publique*: how can you now make them to be *private*? And yet if your bookes were private onely for your owne houſe, yet to [p] ſet vp an Idol in them in ſecret, is not free: The [q] ſecret entiſer vnto Idolatry is ſubiect vnto judgement. 7. whereas

l 2. Sam. 11 2. 4.
m Gen. 38. 18.
n 2. Sam. 13 14.
o Ezek. 23. 14, 16.
p Pag. 3.
p Deut. 27. 15.
q Ibid. c. 13 6.

reas you ſay concerning this Idol, that you will *leave it to judgement, & ſtrive no more*: and confeſſe alſo that you *may ſin in this matter though you ſee it not*: you do hereby ſhew ſome doubting and vncertainty in this queſtion. It is alſo ſome ſigne of remorſe in you, in that here [r] before having as much or more colour to paynt croſſes in ſhewing the maner of conſecrating Churches out of the pontifical, then in ſhewing the maner of popiſh ordination, yet have you now (after admonition and warning) abſtayned from making theſe Idols. But as yourſelf ſayd before, *The abſteyning from the practiſe doth not clear the Synner*; vnleſs you do further repent and renounce your ſin: yea if ſ your reaſoning againſt vs were ſound, your miniſtery ſhould be vnlawfull and not to be communicated withall vntill you had repented for making this Idol. If therfore you ſee not your ſin herein, as you ſay, you ought not to reſt, but rather to deſire to heare more of this queſtion in ſpeciall, that your conſcience might be ſettled and you come to ſome reſolution. But as for your ceaſſing to ſtrive vpon that pretence becauſe I ſpake of ſome that had done this before you and of following a few herein, neglecting the examples of others, &c. this is very vaine: if vpon ſuch pretences men ſhould ceaſs to ſtrive for the truth, you may ſee that many moſt neceſſary controverſies would be cut of, and the truth not mainteyned as is meet. Laſtly, I do not juſtify our evill by your doing the like, as you warne me not to plead: but I labour to condemne your evill, your making of an Idol without cauſe: if this were like vnto our temples I ſhould condemne my ſelf alſo: And I ſhew your fault herein to this end, that you ſeing your errour touching the nature of Idols and Idolatry, might learne to be more ſober, & more ſwift to heare and ſlow to ſpeak againſt the Church of God, and more ſlow to wrath in plucking downe our temples over our heads, vnleſs you could better ſhew the wrath of God againſt them.

r Pag. 175.
s Pag. 85.

CHAP. XIII.

The seventh argument touching temples, examined.

Hen. Ainſ. *OVr 7. reaſon against idolies, &c. is from the bleſsing promiſed to them that aboliſh them, and curſe threatned to the contrary, &c. Eſai. 30. 22. 23, &c. Exod. 20. 5. 6. 2 Chron. 17. 6. and 31. 20. 21. With 2. Chron. 21. 13. 14. and 24. 17.-25. and c. 28.*

To this you say as before, that theſe ſcriptures are all to be vnderſtood partly according to the ſtate and condition of the old teſtament; and partly according to the equitie mentioned before with exception of neceſsary vſe: and therfore they reprove not the vſe of temples which you now have.

But both theſe your anſwers I have before refuted: ſhewing idolatrie and idols to be forbidden as well in the new Teſtament as in the old, 1 Cor. 10. 1. Ioh. 5. Rev. 18. and that the deſtruction of idols and idolies is a moral and perpetual precept, not figurative or temporarie. And your exception of neceſſarie vſe, I have diſproved: ſhewing that for deteſtation of idols, God commanded and his people performed the demoliſhing of them, Exod. 34. Deut. 7. Ezek. 23. Gen. 35. Both theſe are confirmed by the firſt ſcripture in our reaſon here alledged. For in Eſai 30. 22, the coverings and ornaments of idols are propheſied to be caſt away with deteſtation: yet who knoweth not that of them there might be a neceſſarie vſe to men? Whereupon a promiſe of bleſsing foloweth, v. 23, &c. And this propheſie reſpecteth the dayes of the Goſpel, and ſo not the old Teſtament onely: for the rivers of waters vpon every mountaine v. 25. the increaſe of the light of the Sun ſevenfold, v. 26. the promiſes that they ſhould weep no more, v. 19. nor want teachers v. 20. theſe and the like ſpeeches ſhew the propheſie to perteine vnto the new Teſtament. So doth alſo the continuance of it, in Eſai 31. where againe he foretelleth in v. 7. the caſting away of their idols: not becauſe they could not have no neceſſary vſe of them, but becauſe they were their Syn: (which was the reaſon alſo, why Moſes of

ſes of old aboliſhed a the Calf of Iſrael:) and therupon God promiſeth the ruine of their enemies, by the example of the Aſſyrians v. 8. & in ch. 32. he ſheweth by whom this ſhould be obteined, even by the King that ſhould reigne in righteouſnes, which is our Lord Ieſus Chriſt. So your exceptions are but pretexts: and our reaſons remaine in their force for the ruinating of all idolies, and ſo of Antichriſts as bad as any. a Deut 9. 21

Anſwer.

VVHatſoever you have before obiected againſt both my anſwers, is againe anſwered; and for ech of thoſe places which you againe repeat, viz *1. Cor. 10. 1. Ioh. 5. Rev. 18. Exo. 34 Deut. 7. Ezek. 23. Gen. 35.* I have at large ſhewed how you have perverted every one of them, & have in vaine laboured to take away the diſtinction of temporary precepts, and the conſideration of neceſſary vſe. As for the ſcriptures alledged in this ſeventh argument, you leave them all without defence, one onely excepted: let vs examine your allegation thereof, and ſee whether that be not alſo perverted. You ſay, *in Eſai 30. 22. the coverings and ornaments of idols are propheſied to be caſt away with deteſtation: yet Who knoweth not, that of them there might be a neceſſarie vſe to men, &c.* I anſwer, 1. The caſting away of the coverings there mentioned is expreſſely noted and declared in the text, to be as the *caſting away of a ſtained garment*, which was caſt away, onely during the ſtaine vpon it, but being waſhed with water might lawfully be vſed againe; neither did God ever command otherwiſe in his law: And ſo this place is againſt your ſelf, ſhewing that our temples being purged may yet be reteyned: 2, what compariſon is there betwixt the clothing and covering of an Idol and our temples, but even ſuch as there is betwixt the c earthen and the woodden veſſel, whereof one was to be broken and caſt away, the other to be waſhed and reteyned for the proffit of Gods people? 3. The covering and ornament

c Lev 11. 33 & 15 12.

ment of an Idol is of no neceſſarie vſe in the ſervice of God, but the circumſtance of place is neceſſarily required to meet in: and our temples ſerving conveniently for ſuch purpoſe may therfore be reteyned, rather then the ornamēts of Idols. 4. Though this propheſie do reſpect the dayes of the Goſpell as you ſhew from *Eſa. 30, 25. 26, &c.* Yet is it to be vnderſtood and expounded according to the determination of Chriſt and his Apoſtles in the new Teſtament, which ſhew vs a lawfull vſe of every creature of God for the neceſſary help of his people. Otherwiſe without this caveat men might ſtill reteyne the whole ceremoniall law: ſeing there are ſo many prophecies reſpecting the dayes of the Goſpell, which yet tell vs of u Altars, of ſacrifice and oblation, of w incenſe, of x going vp to Ieruſalem to keep the feaſt of Tabernacles, of y building a new temple with ceremoniall obſervations therein, &c. All theſe propheſies reſpect the new Teſtament, deſcribing a ſpirituall worſhip vnder carnall rites and ſhadowes of the law: ſo that though Eſay had ſpoken in this place more ceremonially in the deſcription of our eſtate, then he had done: yet the determinations which I have before ſhewed out of the new Teſtament, muſt be our rule and guide to exxound the ſame: and being ſo expounded your cauſe is not holpen thereby. 5, as for *Eſay. 31. 7. & Deut. 9. 21.* they ſpeak not of places abuſed vnto Idolatry, but of Idols themſelves, ſuch as you cannot prove our temples to be: And beſides this, even Gods owne ordinances in the abuſe thereof are called z *a ſyn* or iniquitie: and therfore this phraſe proves not an vtter abolition of things ſo called, being attributed and given vnto ſuch things as after the purging thereof may and ought to be reteyned. Againe as for the deſtruction of the Calfe in Deut. 9. it was extraordinary, neither were men bound ſtrictly to follow the ſame maner of ſhewing deteſtation againſt idols, no not vnder the law itſelf. Your boaſting in concluſion, that our *exceptions are but pretexts, that your reaſons remaine in their force for the ruinating of all idolies, &c.* is like vnto a pleaſant dreame, wherein you fancie and imagine that which you faine would

t Eſa. 19. 19. 21.
u Mal. 1. 11
x Zach. 14. 16. 17.
y Ezek. 40. chap. &c.
z Eſa. 1. 13

would have: but you may not ſit downe in the throne to judge of your owne diſpute: ſtand vp at the bar and let others judge whether all your ſhot and ordinance have bene able to batter downe our temples: and whether your ſchiſme rather be not neere vnto ruine, which for ſuch pretexts of Idol-temples do ſeparate from all true Chriſtians.

CHAP. XIV.

Touching the Ievves Synagogue.

HEre againe you come, with reaſons from our owne practiſe: which were it ſuch as you ſuppoſe, and that we walked not aright, yet helpeth it you nothing. For the trueth ſhal ſtand, though all men fall: and it is Gods word, not mens wayes, that muſt be our rule in Religion. Hen. Ainſ.

*For your 1. and 2. objections from the houſes, wherin we meet: I have * before proved, they are not, neyther ever were Idolies, nor by any law of God to be deſtroyed, though Ieves or any, have worſhiped in them.* *In the defenſe of our 6. reaſon.

Anſwer.

HEre, before you come vnto the particular anſwer you ſay ſomething in generall by way of complaint, that I ſhould reaſon againſt you from *your owne practiſe*: of this you affirme, that *were it ſuch as I ſuppoſe, &c. yet it helpeth vs nothing, &c.* Herevnto I reply, 1. It helpeth much to ſet forth the glory of God, to confirme the comfort of the faithful, & to ſtop the mouth of iniquitie, when we do obſerve the contradictory practiſe and doctrine of ſuch as are enimies to the Church of God. And God himſelf hath taught vs to vrge ſuch things againſt them that are maintainners of errour, to ſhew how he wil condemne the evil ſervāts a out of their owne mouthes, by their owne words and deeds: how he will b bring their owne Io. Pa.

a Luk. 19. 22
b Ezek. 16. 43.

owne wayes, vpon their heads: how they c fall into the pits
c Pſ. 7. 15. Rom. 2. 1
which they dig for others; how he wil make them d inexcuſable,
d 1. Cor. 3. 19.
when they do the ſame things which they condemne in others: how he e catcheth the wiſe in their owne craftines. In theſe iudgemẽts of God, his glory ſhineth brightly, & they take his name in vaine that do not duely cõſider of theſe his workes in & vpõ you, as wel as vpon others. 2. How do you forget your ſelf, who elswhere do cõfeſſe that f *the teſtimony of the aduerſary againſt him ſelf, doth help our faith?* Your vſe of the Iewes Idol tẽple is a teſtimony againſt your ſelf, & yet here you ſay, were your practiſe *ſuch as we ſuppoſe* that you walked not right, yet it would help vs nothing. VVe ſuppoſe you have no great conſcience of your owne profeſſion, and therfore can not ſo eaſily be drawne to receive your doctrines without further examination of them by the word of God: Herein we are much holpen and kept from ioyning raſhly vnto you. Your owne endevour in your writings is to preſſe your adverſaries with their owne practiſe, as g Mr. Iohnſon and Mr. Smith and others very often: And how partiall therfore are you, that allow that to your ſelf, which you diſallow in others? 3. Though the word of God & not mens wayes muſt be our rule in Religion, yet ſeing ſo many men prefer their owne wayes before the word of God, is it not therfore meete to convince ſuch men by their owne wayes, and to reprove them even by their owne wandrings? As truth deſtroyes errour, ſo doth one errour deſtroy another ſometimes, and one practiſe refute an other: and therfore though the holy ſcriptures onely can ſhew the truth of religion, yet erroneous and contradictory practiſes are alſo a meanes to condemne falſhood & ſtop the mouth of thoſe that maintaine ſuch errours. To this end and not further do we alledge your practiſe: far be it from vs, that we ſhould make your wayes a rule of religion.

f Preface to Annot. on Gen. pag. 6

g Animadv. p. 12. 59. 123. &c.

But now to come vnto the obiection itſelf, I ſeek your anſwer here in the proper place, but finde it not, as I expected: In ſtead hereof you ſend me back vnto the defenſe of your ſixt reaſon, and there in a corner you would hide your head from the force

force of this reproofe, but you muſt be brought forth into the light againe: for 1, howſoever you ſay of this Iewes ſynagogue, which you vſed to aſſemble in, that *you have before proved, that it is not, nor ever was an Idolie:* that have I already reproved and refuted againe: That defenſe of your ſixt reaſon being ſhewed to be vaine. 2. The obiection which I made againſt your ſixt reaſon, did concerne private houſes of Idolatours, as of Papiſts, Moſchovites and ſuch like: but this ſynagogue of the Iewes was not a private place, but a place of publique worſhip where many families of the Iewes did ordinarily meete together in a ſolemne congregation; & ſo alſo hath your ſeparate company done as publiquely and ſolemnely after the Iewes had left it. And therfore thoſe private houſes and this publique ſynagogue are moſt vnequally and vniuſtly matched together, neither can the anſwer of that place be applyed vnto this.

3, you made exception for the private houſes mentioned in the former place that they were *civil houſes*, but the ſynagogue of the Iewes whereof I ſpeak, being for the publique worſhip of God may be called a religious place as well as any other. And though ſome perſons dwelt in ſome part of it, that hinders not but that it was to be eſteemed a religious houſe or ſynagogue: you ſee the moſt of the temples in this citie, have divers perſons dwelling in ſeverall parts of them, which yet you condemne as Idolies: If you were not partiall you would conſider this: for the excuſe of our temples, as well as of the Iewes. The Iewes h accounting their *Beth-midraſch* to be an holy place and more holy then other ſynagogues, do yet confeſſe it may be part of ſuch a building where men may have a dwelling place in ſome other parts of it; in that they i note it to be either an houſe or chamber or parlour (*cheder.*) And if ſuch an excuſe as this which you make, might have ſaved Idol-temples from ruine in the time of the law: then thoſe Idolaters which had once ſeene the overthrow of Baals houſes, might according to this ſhift have taken ſome old palaces or halles and converted them to the ſervice of Baal, for his ordinary and publique

h Arba turim, lib. Otach chaim tractat. beth hacceneſeth, ſigno 153.

i Elias levita in Tiſchbi. in daraſch.

worſhip, ſuffring yet ſome perſons to dwell ſtill in ſome other parts thereof, and by this meanes all danger of ruine ſhould be turned away from them. And if they had not old houſes enough couvenient for their purpoſe, they might make new, provided that they made ſome roomes above or belovv for their Prieſts and other perſons to dvvell in, and then if any *Iehu* or *Ioſias* came to pluck dovvne thoſe Idolies of Chemoſh, Baal or Dagon, they might plead againſt them that thoſe places were civil houſes, and dvvelling houſes of men, though publique vvorſhip vvere ordinarily performed in them, and that therfore ſuch Kings had no authority to demoliſh them: and thus had they had ſome of your ſubtile ſhifts they might have coofened the lavv, deluded the godly Kings and preſerved their Idol-temples from deſtruction.

MOreover vvhereas you ſayd in the defenſe of your ſixt reaſon, touching the Ievves place of publique vvorſhip vvherein you ſucceeded them, that I do vntruely call it *the Iewes Idol-temple*; that it may appeare vnto the reader vvhether I ſpoke truely or not, I deſire theſe fevv things may be conſidered touching the eſtate of the Ievves and their Idolatry according to your ovvne deſcription of Idolatry. As before you led vs into the Popes vvare houſes, the Pontificall and others ſhops of his: ſo here you muſt give me leave to bring you into the Ievves vvare-houſe, the Thalmud and other ſhops of theirs, that by comparing of them vvith the ſtuffe, that is found in ſome of your owne ſhops, I may thereby ſhew vnto you, that the Iewes Synagogue is an Idol-temple.

Firſt, as for the members of the Iewes Church, they are by your owne teſtimony all of them heynous and horrible Idols: for you vvrite that k *the bringing of Satans ſeed into the Church, vnto the Altar of God, may further be minded as a high degree of violating the ſecond commandement, whereby all images, idols and ſimilitudes whatſoever, of the Divel or mens invention or forming are ſeverely forbidden to be brought into Gods houſe, or vſed in his worſhip*

k Counterpoy. pag. 143. 144.

Now

Now ſuch images or Idols are theſe wicked perſons. For as Children are the images of their parents, &c. So Satans Children (as wicked worldlings be called in the ſcripture,) are his lively images, having loſt the firſt image of God wherein they were creat d, &c. As it is a ſyn, and ſo eſteemed, to have images and repreſentations of beaſts, of fowles, of fiſhes, &c. brought into the Church and worſhip of God. ſo would & well might it be eſteemed more horrible, if in any Chriſtian congregation, there ſhould be brought in pictures of the Divil, or other like helliſh repreſentations. Yet men will not ſee the horror of this ſyn, that the living images and pictures of the ſerpent ſhould be brought into the Church and worſhip of God, &c. Now it being manifeſt and vndenyable that the Iewes are vvicked perſons, deſpiſers of Chriſt, and his Goſpell, and profane wordlings alſo, by your owne confeſſion they muſt be Idols, and images, and conſequently the place of their publique vvorſhip a receptackle of Idols, and an Idol-temple. And yet even in the ſame place where ſuch pictures of the Divil and helliſh repreſentations have bene brought into the vvorſhip of God, even there have you agreed to aſſemble together for the ſervice of Chriſt: The horror of that place hath not deterred you from converting it vnto your holy place.

Secondly, as for the miniſters of the Iewiſh Church, according to your doctrine they muſt alſo be eſteemed Idolles: for vnlavvfull miniſters you reckon vp in the catalogue or rolle of Idolles and ſay of them as of others idols; l *Nor is there leſſe impietie in Idols of an other nature and eſteem for when among men one is ſet vp as head of the Church, an other as Patriark, an other as primate, Arch-Biſhop, Metropolitane, &c. & theſe without calling & appoyntment frō God: theſe be Idol-ſhepheards, not true paſtours of the flock, &c.* Now amōg the Ievves at this day, they have vnlavvful offices vvithout calling & appointment from God: Their principall Doctour, to vvhom for honour ſake they give the title of *Gaon* or *excellence*, is m ſayd to be ſo called, becauſe he muſt be expert in the Thalmud & in the ſixtie treatiſes thereof, vvhich by a Cabaliſticall reckoning are found in the vvord Gaon, vvhich

l Arrow againſt Idolatry ch. 1. ſec. 18.

m Elias Levita in Tiſchbi, in Gaon.

n 3 5
6 1
1 6
f 50
60

vvhich n yeeldeth the number of sixtie. And according to his title, vvhich signifyeth pride as vvel as excellencie, so doth this Rabbine presume above the holy scripture, and out of the Thalmud preacheth vnto the Ievves a huge burden and loade of superstitious traditions: And thus his administration becomes Idolatrous. Thus do the inferiour Rabbines and Ievv-doctours also. Their vnlavvfull ministeries might further be observed in the 7. yearely offices vvhich they are o recorded to sell for money, by an open proclamation in their Synagogue, to vvhomsoever vvill give most money for them; as the office of lighting candles, vvhich they performe vvith many superstitions; the office of distributing vvine on their Sabath and at other feasts: the office of *Gelilah* to open the rolle of the lavv and to vvrap it vp againe: the offices of *hagbohah* to cary about and elevate the book of the lavv, &c. the offices of *Ets chaijm*, to touch those peeces of vvood vnto vvhich the volume of the lavv is fastned: in the touching of this tree of life they put great confidence for attayning of vnderstanding, vertue and long life thereby: the office of *Acheron* for to propound something to be read out of the lavv; the office of *schehia*, to be a substitute, ready to supply the office of any of the rest vvhich through negligence should omit the same. And many other vvayes it might be shevved vvhat Idol-shepheards they have. Novv vvhere these Thalmudique doctours have administred, there come you the onely doctour on earth (in your ovvne and your peoples account) that may be lavvfully communicated vvith all; and you that refuse to vvorship in the places vvhere Christe Iesus is preached, have not refused to assemble ordinarily, vvhere Christ Iesus hath bene condemned and a false Messias preached.

o Ioan. Buxt. in Synag. Iud. cap. 22.

Thirdly for their prayers, they do therein commit Idolatry many vvayes. They turne God himself into an Idol (so much as in them lyes) vvhen they call vpon him, by denying the Trinitie of persons and by calling vpon God vvithout Christ: and as yourself note from others, that by false vvorshippers God p is trans-

p Animadv. pag. 73.

trãsformed into an Idol, so may it be noted of the Ievves, in their misconceaving of God and vvorshipping him so misformed in their mindes. And if it be true vvhich is taught in your vvritings, that in the Church of England, Christ is q *an Idol King & an Idol Christe*, how much more evident is it, that the Iewes in their worship do set vp their Christe for an Idol? By your doctrine all set formes of prayer are r *deteſtable Idolles*. Now that the Iewes have publique prescript and set formes of prayer, their *Minhagim* or bookes of their publique leiturgies do shew it abundantly: And your * *Maimony* shewes vs at larg their order for set formes of prayer for appoynted seasons throughout the whole yeare. And so according to your profession, if there were nothing els but this, their Synagogue should be an Idol-temple.

q H. B. disc. p. 161.

r Ibid. p. 64

* Maimon. in misneh, in Seder tephilloth col hasschanah.

Besides this they have many particular and severall prayers and blessings, vvherein they put vaine confidence and make Idols of them. Their s *Krias shema*, or *Keriath shema* (as they call it) hath a multitude of superstitious observations in the vse of it, and as many vaine promises annexed vnto the same. Their prayer which they cal t *Kaddish*, may not be sayd of less then ten persons; and those all the sonnes of nobles and great ones which have brought forth the 2. hayres; some contẽd that there may be one Child or litle one with the other 9, if he have the pentateuch in his hand: others deny it: and these ten must be all in one place, & *sheliac tsibbur* or the minister of their synagogue with them, &c. But if there be a litle court broken fully into a great court; if there be 9 persons in the great court, and one in the litle one, they allow this prayer to be sayd there; but if there be 9 persons in the litle court and one in the great one, or 5 in one and 5 in an other, they allow it not, &c. An other prayer they have which they call *jithgaddel* according to the beginning thereof, or *Keduschah* and this they may not say, in the Hebrew tongue, but in the language of the Thargum, least (as they u say) the Angels hearing the same should envy them for this excellent hymne, and therfore they say it in a lan-

s Arba turim, lib. Orachchaijm tract. tephil. fig. 58 & 70 &c.

t Ibid. fig. 55

u Ibid. fig. 56.

guage which they do not vnderſtand, for the Angels (as they affirme) know not the Aramites tongue. An orher famous prayer they have, which they call *ſchemone Eſre* conſiſting of 18, parts: This they w hold to have bene made by an hundted and twenty Elders and ſome of them Prophets. In giving a reaſon of this myſticall number, why it hath juſt 18 parts, wherevpon it is denominate; *Iehoſhua ben Levi*, x ſaith it is in reference vnto the 18 firſt pſalmes, reaching vnto thoſe words, the Lord heare thee in the day of trouble, &c. *R. Simon* ſaith, it is reſpect of the 18. litle bones or ioynts which are in the back bone, becauſe in the houre that a man ſtands and prayes this prayer, it is of neceſsity that he bow with them all: for which reaſon it is ſayd, *All my bones ſhall ſay, Lord who is like vnto thee*. *R. Levi* ſaith it is in reſpect of the 18. memorialles (of the word Iehovah) which are found in the Pſalme which begins thus, give vnto the Lord ye ſonnes of the mighty, viz. pſ. 29. *R. Hanina* in the name of *R. Phinehas* ſaith, it is in reſpect of the 18. times that the fathers, Abraham, Iſaak and Iaakob are mentioned in the law, &c. A number of other ſuch like prayers they have, wherevnto they attribute miraculous power and vertue, as by the ſaying of their *Kaddiſh* before mentioned they hold that the ſoules of dead men are delivered out of their torment in hell or purgatory and tranſlated into paradiſe: and therfore are Children bound to vſe that prayer for their parents deceaſſed for the ſpace of a yeare or thereabout. Vnto theſe prayers they joyne their *Phylacteries* and make Idols of them alſo: They ſay, [z] Great is the commandement of the Phylacteries: becauſe every one that weares them ſhall prolong his dayes, as it is ſayd, ô Lord by them men live: And *Rabba* ſaith every one that puts on the Phylacteries & vweares *zizith* or the fringes and reades *Keriath ſhema*, and prayes, let him be ſure that he is a Childe of the world to come. And *Abaii* ſaith, I will be his ſurety that the fire of hell ſhall not have power over him. *R. Papa* ſaith, I will be his ſurety, thar all his ſinnes ſhalbe forgiven him, &c. The Thalmudique canons teach that [a] thoſe Phylacteries which are

vv Thalm. Babylonic. in megillah ch. 2. fol. 17.

x Thalmud Ieruſalemy in Beracoth ch. 4. f. 7. and. 8.

z Arba Turim, lib. or. cha, tractat Thephillin fig. 37.

are written [a] by a ſervant, by a woman, by a child, by a gentile, or an Iſraelite changed from them, are vnlawfull for vſe, &c. that if they be written by an heretique, then they are to be burnt: if they be found in the hand of an heretique & it be not knowne whether they were vvritten by him or not, that then they are to be buryed, &c. with an hundred ſuperſtitious more about the making, vſing, keeping and vaine confidence in them.

a Thalmud Bab. in Menachoth cap. 4. f. 42 Arba Turim, orach chaim in Thephillin ſig. 39. & in Gittin, c. 4. fol. 45.

Againe they turne the ordinance of the prieſts *lifting vp his hands* in bleſſing the people, into great ſuperſtition; [b] none of the prieſts may go vp vnto the ſtaires, pulpit or ſcaffold from whence the bleſſing is pronounced, but he muſt firſt put of his ſhooes. All the prieſts that are preſent are bound to go vp vnto the ſcaffold (vvhē the Miniſter of the cōgregation comes to a certaine prayer, called *ratſah*, &c.) & they that do not, ſin againſt three affirmative comandements, viz. *Thus ſhall ye bleſs them: ſay vnto vnto them: put my name vpon them:* vvhen they are gone vp they are to ſtand on the ſcaffold vvith their faces towards the temple and their backes towvards the people, having their fingers bowed into the middes of the palme of their handes, vntil the Miniſter have finiſhred an other prayer *Modim*, &c. ¶ When they turne their faces towards the people to bleſſe, they do firſt bleſſe the Lord for that bleſſing, for ſanctifying them with his ſanctification of Aharon, &c. Then they lift vp their hands over againſt their ſhoulders in height, and open their fiſt and devide their fingers according to the *midraſch*, he ſhewes himſelf through the grates; becauſe that *Schecinah* or the divine Maieſtie is above vpon their heads and looketh through the grates of their fingers; and they direct or ſet them ſo, that they may make windooes for the Lord, betwixt ech. two fingers one window; and betwixt a thumb and a finger; and betwixt thumb and thumb a window, (9 windowes in all) to eſtabliſh or fulfill that ſaying, he ſhewes himſelf through the grates. (*Cant. 2. 9.*) Then their Miniſter reads or prayes thoſe words: *The Lord bleſſe thee*, &c. *Num. 6. 24. 25. 26.* And they ſay after him word for word till he have finiſhed the firſt verſe; and then the congregation

b Orach chaim in Tephillah ſig. 128. comp with R. Moſes Mikkotſ. in SMG. precep. affir. 20.

gation answers Amen, and so they do also after the second and againe after the third verse of that blessing. And they may not blesse but in the holy tongue: and standing, and with lifting vp of hands, and with a high voyce, &c. The Priest that is *dzebalgan*, .i. which lets his spitle fall vpon his beard, or is blinde of one eye, may not lift vp his handes in this blessing: but if the men of his citie be vsed vnto him and do all know that he is *Zebalgan*, and blinde, then he may lift vp his hands: If his hands be coloured with divers colours and skarlet, he may not lift vp his hands, least they should be offended at him: but if the multitude of the mē of the citie do vse such work, then he may lift vp his hands, then they will not be offended at him, &c If the priest e drink a quadrant of wine at one draught, then he may not lift vp his hands: but if he drink it at two draughts, or two times: or if he put a litle water into the middes of it, then it is lawfull for him: but if he drink more thē a quadrant, although it be mixt, and although he drink it at divers times, yet he may not lift vp his hands, vntill he put his wine from him, &c. And many other vaine observations they have about this particular. If any man have seene a dreame, & knowes not what he hath seene, he is to come before the Priests in the houre that they go vp vnto the scaffold where they lift vp their hands to blesse: and to say thus, o Lord of the world, I am thine, & my dreames are thine: I have dreamed a dreame and I know not what it is: whether I have dreamed for my self, or whether others have dreamed for me, if they be good confirme and ratifie them, as the dreames of Ioseph; if they be evill, heale them, heale them, as the waters of *Marah* by the handes of *Moses*, and as the waters of *Iericho* by the hands of *Elisha*, as *Miriam* from her leprosy, and as *Naaman* from his leprosy, &c. Besides these prayers and blessings, they have also their solemne curses, wherein they curse Christians and even Christ Iesus himself, praying for the destruction of Christians, especially of those Iewes that are converted to Christianitie: wishing also that the name of Iesus may be blotted out, as is h noted frō their

d Orach Cha. in Tephillah sig. 128.

e Maimony in misn. in Tephillah ch. 15. sec. 4.

f Arba Turim, lib. Orach cha in Tephillah. signo. 130.

h Buxtorf. de abbrev. p. 87.

their *jlmmach schemo*, though they do it more covertly, according to their Cabalisticall art. Yea, it appeares that they are more carefull of these curses, then of many other blessings: for their canon is, that i if the minister of their congregation do erre in any one of all the blessings by omitting or skipping over the same: if when they admonish him, he know how to returne vnto the place, they do not remoove him: but if he skip over the curse of heretiques (vnder which they reckon those that do embrace Christianitie), they do forthwith remoove him least he himself be an heretique, &c. Now while you plead against our temples that they are to be destroyed and avoyded as being k *Devilles houses*: if your plea be sound, then may it justly be vsed against yourself: for as the Devil is denominate of slandering and accusing, so where cursing, and blasphemy are joyned with superstition and Idolatry, the house where these sins are ordinarily and publiquely practised, may well be called a Devilles house; and consequently that meeting house of the Iewes which you chose to be your house of prayer. Hereby you have condemned your self in that wherein you vvould blame vs.

i Orach Chaiim, in Tephillah, sig. 126.

k Pag. 169.

Fourthly, they make an Idol of the holy scriptures vvhich they vse in their synagogue: of the book of the lavv in speciall: and of the reading thereof. One superstition is, that they hold it l vnlavvfull for a man vvhich hath the booke of the lavv to sell the same, though he have many of them: yea that it is vnlawfull to sell an old one to buy a new one, even when a man hath nothing to eat: onely they allow a man in this case of necessitie to sell the same, viz. to pay for learning of the law, and for the taking of a wife, vvhen he hath no other meanes to procure the same, &c. An other superstition is, that they m make it vnlawfull to write the booke of the law save vpon the parchment which is made of the skin of a cleane creature: and not vpon the skin of a fish though it be cleane, but vpon the skin of a cleane beast, fowle or living creature which is cleane: also not vpon the skin of those creatures which are dead and torne.

l Arba Turim, lib. Ioreh degnah trac. Seph. thorah sig. 270.

m Ibid. sig. 271.

They hold it not lawfull to write the same vpon the parchmēt made of the skin of a cleane beast, vnlesse the skin be dressed purposely to that vse at the first, vnlesse it be made in that name and dedicate to such vse: *R. Moses bar Maimon* n writes further, that if a gentile dresse them they are vnlawfull, though an Israelite say vnto him, dresse these skins for a book of the law: but *R. Baruch* o writes that if a gentile make them and an Israelite stand at his back and help him a litle, then they are lawfull. Also for the maner of dressing them, they p hold it vnlawfull to dresse these skinnes save with galles: though *R. Tam* allowes the lime which they have to that purpose. They make great question, vpon which side of the parchment the law is to be written and thereabout do *Maimony* and *R. Aſcher* differ among themselves. Also they hold it is not to be written but with inke: but *R. Tam* saith it is not called inke, but they make it of certaine kindes of knowne thornes which are sodden, and of that water they make it, but if it be inke made with galles, then it is vnlawfull for a book of the law, &c. further they q hold superstitiously, that the scribe which writes the book of the law, must of necessitie when he begins to write say thus; *this booke I write that it may be a holy book of the law*: and this sufficeth for every book, and if he do not thus, the book is vnlawfull. Also that he must have a book before him out of which he may copie it: that it is vnlawfull to write even one letter which is not out of the copie: (though he knew it never so perfectly without the same.) Seven letters comprehended in the words, *Schagnanaz gats* they do idolize after a speciall manner, r writing over them 3 crownes, so often as they are repeated in the law, one crowne on the right side of the letter, an other on the left, an other above: These crownes are not to be found in any Hebrew Bible that is printed: Therfore the Iewes vse in their synagogue not a printed, but a written book of the law. Againe, although the scribe in the beginning of his writing, do say he writes the same in the name of a holy book for the cōsecration thereof, yet it is further s required as necessary, that so often as he

n Maimony in misneh, tract. Tephillin c. 1. sec. 11

o Iore deah, tract. Sepher thorah. fig. 271

p Ibid.

q Ior. deah. in Seph. thor. fig. 271.

r Ibid. with Thalmud in menachoth, f. 29.

s Ior. dea. fig. 276.

he writes the name of God, he do every time think in himself that he writes that name for a holy vse, and if he do not so, the writing is vnlawfull. And if a King salute him, as he is writing that name, he may not answer him. And when he hath dipt his pen into the ynke to write the name of God, it is not lawfull for him immediately to begin with the name of God least there should bee too much ynke in the pen, but for a præparative he must first begin to write the word that comes before the name of God, with that new penfull of ynke. If he write any of the name of God in gold, it is vnlawfull: And a number of other superstitious traditions they have about the measures of the booke, the forme of the letters, the sections open and shut, the distances betwixt book and book, section and section, line & line; about the correction of literal faults, and the toleration of them: about the ruling of the book, the sowing of the parchments with the sinowes of cleane beasts, &c. But when it is made, then they t give great honour vnto this book of the law: they are commanded to make a peculiar place for it, and to honour that place with great reverence: they may not spit before it, nor turne their backes towatd it, nor cary it vpon their heads as if it were a burden: they that see it as it passes by are bound to stand still, vntill it be passed by and brought vnto his place, or vntill it be covered from their eyes. He that travelles from place to place and hath the book of the law with him, may not put it in a sack, nor lay it vpon the back of the asse whereon he rides, but he must put it in his bosome, over against his heart. They may not sit vpon that bed, where this booke is layd: They may not touch this book, but through a vayle, wherewith it must first be covered: They may not bring it into many places: And that house where it is, may not be vsed as before it was. When it is worne out, or made vnmeet for vse, they must put it into an earthen vessell, and so bury it: and this, nere vnto one of their wise disciples or Rabbines. They distinguish betwixt this book of the law, and the pentateuch, or 5. bookes of Moses, in respect of this forme and maner of writing, though

t Ior. dea. in Seph. th. sig. 282.

the ſame words be conteyned in both : Though they may lay this book vpon the back of an other book of the law, and the pentateuch vpon the Prophets, and Pſalmes, &c. yet they may not lay the Prophets and pſalmes vpon the back of the pentateuch, nor the pentateuch vpon the back of this book of the law : ſuch ſuperſtitious differences and degrees of holynes do they forge vnto themſelves. The ſuperſtitions which they vſe in reading this book of the law in their ſynagogues, are alſo very many: concerning the time, the perſons, the order to be obſerved herein; and too long it would be to rehearſe the ſame In like manner alſo do they Idolize the booke of Eſter, both in the writing and in the reading thereof, vſing many of the very ſame ſuperſtitions which they do about the book of the law, though not ſo preciſe herein: yet have they many peculiar traditions here alſo, as what the names of the tē ſonnes of *Haman* are to be written after the manner of a ſong, and yet not as common ſonges; that the names of the men are to be written in the beginning of the leafe or line, and that the particle, *veeth* that goes with ech of them is to be written in the end of the line; and that otherwiſe the writing is not lawfull : that in the reading of them alſo, they are all to be read with one breath: with a multitude of the like deviſes. Now, if popiſh ſuperſtitions have defiled our temples, and made them vnfit for our vſe, how comes it that theſe abſurd and manifold Iewiſh ſuperſtitions have not defiled their ſynagogue and made it vnfit for your vſe?

[u] Orach. ch. tract. keriath hattorah. fig. 135 136, &c.

Yv thalmud Ieruſalemy in megillah. ch. 3. fol. 74. with Orach cha. in megil. fig. 690 691. Maimony in Megillah c. 2.

Fiftly, the Sacrament of Circumciſion obſerved among the Iewes, is alſo ſet vp for an Idoll among them. As you note of the Popiſh Baptiſme, that there are [x] *two ſorts of idols* therein, ſome merely deviſed by men: as their croſſes, exorciſmes, greaſings, &c. ſome perverted by men from holy ſignes to idols, &c So may you ſee both theſe kindes of idols in the Iewiſh circumciſion: for (not to ſpeak of many other ſuperſtitions) their [y] *priah*, or tearing of the other ſkin with their nayles, (after the foreſkin be cut away) is merely deviſed by themſelves, a more pai-

[x] Animadv p. 72.

[y] Arba-turim, li. Iordea, in Milah, fig. 264 R. Moſes mikk. in SMG. præcep. affir. 28

painefull and dangerous thing vnto the circumciſed infant, thē is the cutting of the foreſkin itſelf. And this *priah* or *perignah*, they hold to be ſo neceſſary, that they make circumciſion without it to be no circumciſion : they ſay, he that circumciſeth and vſeth not this *priah*, is as if he had not circumciſed. Herein their ſuperſtition is greater then the Papiſts, who do not maintaine ſuch a neceſſitie of their inventions and deviſes in the adminiſtration of Baptiſme. Againe, their [z] cuſtome is to ſet a chaire or ſeat for *Elias* at their act of circumciſing: and the originall of this cuſtome is noted by them to be this: when *Elias* complayned, I have bene very jelous for the Lord, becauſe the houſe of Iſrael have forſaken thy coverant (1 Kin. 19. 15.) the Rabbines ſay that from that time the Lord made a promiſe vnto *Elias* that the Iſraelites ſhould never performe that covenant or work of circumciſion, vntill *Elias* did ſee it with his eyes: and that from thence forward their wiſe men ordeyned to ſet a chaire for *Elias*, becauſe he is called the Angell of the covenant. Herein they commit heynous Idolatrie, by aſcribing vnto *Elias* a divine power and propertie as though he could be preſent in many places at once wherſoever circumciſion is administred : As the Papiſts offend by mainteyning the body of Chriſt to be preſent in their maſſe wherſoever it is celebrated; ſo do the Iewes by mainteyning the body of *Elias* to be preſent in their Idol-circumciſion vvherſoever it is adminiſtred by thē, honouring his preſence alſo by ſetting a chaire or throne for him, &c. Againe they turne the ordinance of God into an Idol, by mainteyning an vſe of it, vvhen as it is now aboliſhed: and eſpecially by putting ſo great confidence therein, as that they do thereby [a] aboliſh themſelves from Chriſt and the ſalvation purchaſed by him. They hold the commandement of circumciſion to be greater then the reſt of the commādements that are to be performed: they ſay [b] that *there are thirteene covenants made concerning circumciſion*; becauſe the word covenant is found to be 13. times repeated in *Gen. 17.* where circumciſion was inſtituted; They [c] alledge out of their *Bereſhith rabbah* that

[z] Ioreh dea. tract. milah or of circumciſion fig. 265.

[a] Gal. 5. 2. 3. 4.

[b] Thalmud in Nedarim ch. 3. fol. 31

[c] Arba turim, l. Iordea. in milah, fig 260

Abraham our father sits at the gate of Hell and suffers not any that are circumcised to be gathered in thither. They affirme that by it men are delivered from the judgement of hell. The *Chaldee paraphrast* expounding those words of Solomon, *every one hath his sword upon his thigh for the feare by night*, d notes this sword vpon the thigh to be the seale of circumcision in the flesh, whereby they prevayle and do not feare the divelles or the toads that walk abroad in the night. Yea such confidence they have in this ceremony, that they vse to e circumcise dead infants to obteyne and procure the more mercy for them at the resurrection, though after an other manner, then other infants be commonly circumcised Now you that condemne our vse of temples, which have bene abused heretofore vnto the worshipp of Saints: vvhy were you not afraid to worshipp in that Synagogue where *Elias* hath bene deifyed by the Iewes, and divine honour given vnto him being but one of the Saints? you that refuse to heare all the ministers of Christ sitting in *Moses* chaire, what meane you to go and sit in *Elias* his chaire, to teach and preach vnto your people in that very place where the Iewes have set that Idolatrous chaire for *Elias*?

d Thargum on cant. 3.8

e Arba Turim, l. Iordea. treat. of buriall, sig. 353. & of circumcis. sig. 263.

Sixthly, the feasts of the Iewes which they keep at this day cannot be denyed of you to be Idols, whiles you f say as much of *the Idol-feasts* in the Church of England. A whole volume would not suffice to expresse the innumerable superstitions of the Iewes which they observe herein: They have a whole book in folio conteyning their preparation vnto one of their feasts, shewing onely what is to be done in the evening of their passeover. I will onely note one or two of their impious practises. At their feast of reconciliation, their manner in some places is to kill a cock for reconciliation. h The minister of the congregation vseth to take a cocke, and layes his hand vpon his head, and lifts him vp, and layes him vpon the head of him that is to be reconciled and saith; *This for this: This is changed for this: This is wounded for this.* Then he turnes vnto him the second time and saith, *They sit in darknes and in the shadow of death, being*

f H.B. disc. p. 181.

h Arba turim lib. Orach chaim. tract. jom haccippurim, sig. 605.

being bound in miserie and yron: He bringeth them out of darknes & the shadow of death, and breaks their bands asunder: fooles by reason of their transgression and because of their iniquities are afflicted: Then they cry vnto the Lord in their trouble and he delivereth them out of their distresse he sends his Word and healeth them, and delivereth them from their graves: Let them confesse before the Lord his loving kindnes, and his Wonders vnto the Sonnes of men. Life for life. And he doth according to this order three times. After this he layes his hand vpon the head of the cock after the manner of laying on of hands, and leaning vpon him killeth him presently: straight way after the imposition of hands is the slaughter of him. And they vse to give him vnto the poore that this may be a reconciliation for his life, &c. At their feast of *Purim*, their maner is in reading the book of Ester to say, i *Cursed be Haman: Blessed be Mordecai: Cursed be Zeresh, Blessed be Ester: Cursed be all that serve Idolles* (vnder these they comprehend all Christians:) *Blessed be all Israel, &c.* Yea in the k same place they say that they are commanded to make great cheare, and that *it is necessary to be drunken, till they cannot discerne betwixt Arur Haman, and Baruch Mordecai, &c.* till they know not *Haman* from *Mordecai*: blessing from cursing, &c. Of all the Idolatrous feasts that are kept either at *Roome* of the Papists or at *Constantinople* among the Turkes, I think you cannot name any more detestable then these, where Christ is so dishonoured and Christianity so directly blasphemed and cursed, and drunkennes so extolled for a vertue: yet are you become so partiall in yourself and a judge of such evill thoughts, that you blush not to condemne our vse of temples for the superstition of the former times, while your selves dare venture into this Iewish synagogue, a nest of superstition nothing inferiour vnto the Papists.

i Ibid. tract. megillah, sig. 690.

k sig. 695. & Talmud Bab. in Megill. c. 1. fol. 7.

Seventhly, as for the discipline and censures vsed among the Iewes you can not deny them to be Idolles, whiles you l make the suspension vsed in true Churches of Christ to be *Idolatrous* and an *Idol-suspension*; though nothing so absurd and vile as is that

l H. B. disc. p. 234 & 236.

that suspension of the Iewes. The censures of the Iewes are many first they have a kinde of rebuke which they cal *neziphah*, this they m refer to the initial letters of *nezem zahab be--aph,&c. a Iewell of gold in a swines snout: Prou.11.22.* This they describe to be the n rebuke of a great man vpon an other: And the manner is, that he which hath it vpon him must hide himself & sit in his house, and be ashamed and not see the face of him that hath rebuked him, nor stād before him with his head vncovered, and must diminish his mirth his talke his exercises, &c. But others need not to avoyd him, neither is he required to seek reconciliation with him that is offended, neither is any absolution required after this rebuke hath bene borne a certaine time. Againe, they have three sorts of excōmunication, *niddui, cherem and shamatha*, all which as they are now vsed by the Iewes, are Idolatrous and superstitious. For the first, which is a kinde of suspension, they o assigne foure and twenty causes for which it is to be inflicted: Among the rest, one cause is, for despising even one word of the scribes, &c. vvhich are most absurd and impious many times and ought to be despised: An other vnreasonable cause is, if a Iew sell any ground vnto a gentile that is an Idolater (such they account all to be that call vpon the name of Christ) they suspend him, vntill he will take vpon himself all the hurt which may come thereby from the gentile vnto an Israelite, &c. Him that is suspended they avoyd in eating and drinking with him and must sit 4. cubites from him: during the time of this reiection he may not shave himself, nor wash himself, &c. p He that is thus suspended or reiected by a Rabbine, is reiected of his scholler, but he that is reiected of the scholler is not reiected of the Rabbine. He that is reiected of the Father of the Iudgemeut house, is reiected of the *wise man* but he that is reiected of the *wise*, is not reiected of the Father of the judgement-house. q He that is reiected of the prince, is reiected of all Israel: but he that is reiected of all Israel is not reiected of the prince, &c. As for the absolution and loosing this band, the forme of words vsed is, *scherui lach, machol lach*: *Thou*

n Elias Levita in Tischbi in nazaph.

n Arba Turim in Ioreh dea. tract. Niddui. sig. 334.

o Maymony in misneh, in Thalmud chorah, ch. 6.

p Thalmud Ierusalemy in moed katon ch. 3 f. 81. col. 4.

q Ior. dea. vbi supra.

Thou art loosed: thou art forgiven: and if the man to be absolved be absent, they say, *scherui lo: He is loosed:* Touching the persons that may absolve, r *Maimony* saith, that three Idiots or private men, or one alone that is approoved may absolve the suspended person, and that a Thalmid or disciple of the Rabbines may loose either the anathema or the suspension even in the place of the Rabbie; If three have suspended a man and be gone away; if the suspended person repent, three others may absolve him, but s *R. Abraham ben Dior* writes that three other can not absolve him except they be as great as the three former: & that a third man may give authoritie vnto two to absolve, &c. That if a man be reiected by this censure of *niddui* and he know not who it is that hath reiected him, there is no other may absolve him but the Prince: but if he know who hath reiected him, then he that reiected, may absolve, though he be one of the people of the Land, or an other like him. They give speciall warning that whosoever will absolve or loose that which his neighbour hath bound must consider diligently whether he be equal vnto him whether he may be compared with him in wisedome, and that if he be not like vnto him in the feare of God and in greatnes that then the absolutiō be performed by two, &c. Many other are the superstitious devises about this matter, as touching those that are t reiected by an oth, touching those that are reiected by dreame, not to be absolved but by 10. persons, of such and such qualities: touching the number of dayes both for *neziphah and niddui*: touching the stone to be left vpon the chest of him that dyes without absolution: touching *cherem* or anathema the second kinde of excommunication: to be u executed with candles lighted in the synagogue, and extinguished vpon the curse pronounced, to signify that the person so reiected is deprived of the light of heaven: touching their *shamatha* also, &c. In these censures of the Iewes there is as much superstition and impietie practised, as is by the Papists in their curses: and in this regard you had as much cause to have avoyded the Iewes synagogue vsed by you, as we have to avoyd any place abused by the

r Misneh in Thalmud thor. 2.7.

s Ex Arba Turim vbi supra.

t Ibidem, & Maimony in Thal. thor. vbi supra.

u Ioa Buxt. Epist. Heb. institut. c. 6

Papists for their superstitious discipline.

Lastly, the very place itself, the house of prayer or the synagogue where the Iewes do assemble for their worship, is vnto them a holy place, and consequently according to your reasoning before, is vnlawfull to be vsed, and to be avoyded as a very Idol, for the holynes that is put in the same. Their Thalmudicall canons require and enioyne them, x not to laugh, iest, or talk therein: not to eat or drink there; not to dresse themselves there: not to walk vp and downe there: not to go thither in the heat to avoyd the heat of the sunne: nor in time of rayne to avoyd a shewer: yet they hold it lawfull for the disciples of their *Chacamim*, their wise rabbines to eat and drink in that place: They hold it vnlawfull for a man to invent or devise any matter there except it be some work of almes, the redeeming of captives or the like. They allow not a man to mourne in that place, except it be for some great man of the citie, when as all the inhabitants of the citie be gathered together to lament him: They forbid men to meet one an other there for any necessary busines: but if they do meet there, they are required first to read a verse (of the Bible,) or to speak a word out of the *Thalmud*: but if they can neither read nor repeat any thing out of their traditionall bookes, then they are required to say vnto some childe, read me a verse, &c. that they may not seeme to have met there for any other necessary businesse. Their custome is to light candles there for honour, and to bring sweet herbes or flowres, &c. They esteeme their synagogue so holy, that they make it a dangerous matter to spit there: y *R. Chalaphta ben Saul* saith if a man neeze in prayer it is an evill signe to him. (*R. Moses mikkotsi*, saith if the spit be ready to arise it is to be swallowed, SMG. precepr. affir. 19.) *R. Hanina* telles how he saw a Rabbine coughing or neezing & laying his hand on his mouth but did not spit. *R. Iochanan* saith, he that spits in the synagogue, let him see that his ‖ cup be cleane: or as *R. Moses mikkotsi* relates it, that his * bag or Chest be cleane: & this he expoundes of his body: How this may be done is shewed

vv pag. 178.

x Arba Turim, lib. Orachchaijm tract. beth haccenesseth. sig. 151 R. Alphes in megillah c. 3. f. 356.

y Thalmud Ierusalemy in Beracoth c. 3. fol. 6. col. 4.

‖ coso.

* ciso.

wed in the Thalmud by this rule that is there given: to spit before him is vnlawfull: to spit after him is lawfull: to spit on the right hand is vnlawfull: but on the left hand it is lawfull: *R. Iehoshuah ben Levi* saith, he that spits in the house of the congregation, is as if he did spit in the apple of his eye. *R. Ionah* saith, he that spits let him rub it out. *R. Ieremie and R. Samuel* say, he that prayes let him not spit till he goe 4 cubites from the place. *R. Iose* saith, he that spits let him not pray till he go 4. cubites from the place. These are the learned Iew doctours, and ancient Rabbines without whose help (as you say) we cannot well vnderstand the scriptures. To confirme and countenance the rule before mentioned, shewing at what side a man must spit in case of necessitie; it is alledged in the same place of the Thalmud, *this is that which is written, a thousand shall fall at thy side.* (ps. 90.) to wit, if this rule of spitting in right maner be duely observed. z *R. Ismael the son of Eleazar* saith, that for the wickednes of two things or of two words the people of the earth do dy, because they call the holy ark (aron) arna; and because they call the house of the congregation, the house of the folk or people; *beth gnam*: viz. because they do not in their speech honour the synagogue, with a holy title. Now these and many other the like superstitious observations do shew that the Iewes put as much and more holynes in their synagogue, then the papists do in their temples: for the Papists do not forbid men to walk vp and downe therein: they do not forbid men to fly thether to avoyd a shewer of rayne: they are not so scrupulous about spitting there, &c. And therfore the blame that you would lay vpon vs for reteyning of such temples wherein superstitious persons have put holynes, doth redound vnto your owne reproofe and comes more heavily vpon your owne head for vsing the Iewes synagogue.

z Thalmud Babylonic. in Schabbath. c. 2. fo. 32.

CHAP. XV.

Touching the present meeting-house still reteyned by *Mr. Ainsworth.*

Hen. Ainſ. a In the defenſe of our 6t. reaſon.

FOr your 1. and 2. obiections from the houſes wherin we meet: I have a *before proved, they are not, neyther ever were Idolies, nor by any law of God to be deſtroyed, though Iewes or any, have worſhiped in them.*

Anſwer.

Io, Pa. AS you did formerly vſe a Iewes ſynagogue for the place of your worſhip: ſo do you now preſently vſe the ſynagogue or meeting-houſe, where *Mr. Johnſon* and his people after your diviſion and ſeparation from them, did ſtill vſe to meete together for the publique ſervice of God: And this meeting houſe according to your doctrine is an Idolie, or place of Idols, which by you ought to be avoyded as well as our temples.

First, for the conſtitution of *Mr. Johnſons* Church aſſembling in that place: by your teſtimonie and dealing therewith it muſt needes be falſe in as much as they did degenerate and prove obſtinate ſinners, in your account: while you witneſſe of them, that // Animad. p.48. *// their errour did eat out the very conſtitution of the church:* that *they* a Animadv. p.129. *departed from and ſpake evill of, and perſecuted the truth and way* b Ibidem. p.132. *of God, wherein they had once walked with you.* You ſay that b *daily in their publique doctrines and prayers they inveighed againſt the truth they formerly profeſſed, wounded the conſciences of the brethren & ſought all occaſions to draw men from the right way and practiſe of the Goſpell. What ſhould we doo, but ſhake of the dust of our feet againſt ſuch authors of errours and peace breakers?* Now ſuch obſtinate & degenerate apoſtates, againſt whom men may ſhake of the duſt of their feet, cannot by your owne confeſsion be the true

true matter of a Church, nor yeeld a true conſtitution thereof: and being *a falſe conſtitution ſet vp in ſtead of a true*, you alſo therein acknowledge it c *a very Idol.* And as you thus make the body of their conſtitution in generall to be an Idol; ſo the ſeverall members in particular being according to your judgement of them, wicked apoſtates perſiſting in ſin, they alſo by your writing are to be deemed d *Satans images, pictures of the divell and helliſh repreſentations*, and conſequently their meeting houſe an Idol-temple. c Counterp. p.172. d Ibid. p.144.

Secondly, for the worſhip of that Church: you muſt needes confeſſe it to be Idolatrous alſo, vpō the former ground. For whereas you write that e *the bodies and ſoules of men are ſpirituall and living ſacrifices, and the perſons offred in the Church by the miniſtery of the Goſpell, ſhould be as the holy flock, as the flock of Ieruſalem in the ſolemne feaſt, &c.* The people of *Mr. Johnſons* company being as you have accuſed them obſtinate and degenerate apoſtates, perſiſting in wickednes, herevpon all that blame which you impute vnto the worſhip in the Church of England falles vpon their heads vpon your owne graunt; namely that *they neither deſerve to be layd on Gods Altar nor to be touched of any true Iſraelite in ſuch reſpect, &c.* that *the precious body and blood of Chriſt repreſented by bread and wine at his ſupper, is proſtituted vnto the wicked and vnworthy receyvers in that church, &c.* that *baptiſme is there given vnto the ſeed of the moſt vngodly, blaſphemers & enimies of Chriſt, vnto whom by no right it doth appertayne: That there is a ſacrilegious profanation of the holy myſteries, &c. That the bringing of Satans ſeed into the Church, vnto the altar of God may further be minded as a high degree of violating the ſecond commandement, whereby all images, idols or ſimilitudes whatſoever, of the Divils or mens invention or forming, are ſeverely forbidden to be brought into Gods houſe, or vſed in his worſhip, &c. That they remayning in impenitency, &c. have no word or premiſe in ſcripture that Chriſt is the Prieſt or ſacrificer of ſuch worſhip or worſhippers.* And muſt not that place where all this falſe and Idolatrous worſhip hath bene performed, be acknowledged to be an Idol-temple? yet is e Coūterp. p.142.143. 144.145.

it now your temple.

f Pag.26 Thirdly, for the ministers of *Mr. Iohnsons* company, I ſ ſhewed them before out of your owne writings to be Idolles: and you deny it not. And it may further appeare by that which you

g Animadv P.59.--67. vvrite against their g *ministerie executed by such as have not rightly bene called by the Church whereof they stand ministers, &c.*

Fourthly for their governement; you call it a h *prelacie: a new*

h Ibid.p.36 38.42. *estabiſhed hierarchie: a ſpirituall tyrannie:* and ſuch governours,

i Arrow against Idol.p.19. you hold to be i *Idolles*. Beſides *Mr. Iohnſon* vſing the cenſure of

k H.B.diſc. p.234.& 236. ſuſpenſion which heretofore you held to be an k *Idol*, his governement in that reſpect is idolatrous according to your profeſſion. Novv there being ſo many Idolles in the conſtitution, miniſtery, vvorſhip and governement of that Church, the 4. maine heads of tranſgreſſion imputed by you vnto the Church of England, hovv can you blame vs for our vſe of temples, whē as yourſelves even to this houre do ſtill reteyne that meeting houſe, where all theſe Idols have bene diſcovered by you?

If you will diſtinguiſh betwixt Idols, whereof ſome cauſe ruine to the temples, and others not: ſhew vs a cleare warrant from the ſcriptures for ſuch diſtinction, & you ſhall then finde hovv many wayes it will returne vpon your owne heads. And beſides you cannot help yourſelf with any ſuch diſtinction; becauſe you do already here affirme in expreſſe words, that theſe houſes are not to be deſtroyed *though Iewes or any have worſhipped in them*. So that though Indians had vvorſhipped the divell in his ovvne perſon in your ſynagogue neither that nor any other of the groſſeſt Idolatry ſhould have hurt your priviledged place, though far leſſe Idolatries might tumble dovvne our Churches.

If you vvill ſend vs ſtill vnto the defenſe of your 6t. reaſon; you may ſee it before refuted: and beſides, that vvhich you there ſayd of private dvvelling houſes, vvill not ſerve to excuſe your place of ordinary and publique aſſembly for the vvorſhip of God.

If you or any of yours ſhould except, that this your ſynagogue

gue vvas not built by Antichriſt, nor dedicate to Antichriſtian Idolatry: that vvill not help you: you cut of yourſelf from having any excuſe thereby, vvhiles in your reply vnto *Mr. Ber.* making ſuch a like anſvver vnto you, you ſay in effect, that l *the law of God makes no inquiry*, by vvhom ſuch places have bene built, but vvhether Idolaters have ſet vp their Idolatry there and vvorſhipped in ſuch places. Yea if your arguing be ſound, if the Church of God ſhould build a nevv temple for his lavvfull ſervice & vvorſhip, and if the Papiſts or other Idolaters ſhould by violence take the ſame from them and vſe it but one yeare or one moneth for their Idolatrous ſervice: by your doctrine it could never be lawfully employed againe vnto the ſervice of Chriſte by any true Chriſtians. And therfore by the ſame reaſon is your meeting houſe to be aboliſhed and deſtroyed, having bene defiled with ſo many Idolles.

l Counterp. p.199.

CHAP. XVI.

Touching almes receyved publiquely in an Idol-Temple.

For your 3. it is an obiection of a former adverſarie, and heretofore publickly anſwered. But the anſwers, you ſay, are inſufficient. For, the difference betweene the ordinary publick worſhip in ſuch places, & the occaſional receiving of almes therin by the poore, can not (you ſay) without manifeſt untruth be affirmed or applied to the matter in hand. Your reaſon is, the diſtribution of this almes, is not occaſional, but an ordinary publik work of mercie, &c. I anſwer; The publik worſhip of the Church is Eccleſiaſtical, the almes here ſpoken of, is political and civil: to put no difference betweene theſe, is manifeſt errour and ignorance; and let all men of knowledge, be judges. Againe, peoples of all Religions or of no Religion, which never goe thither for religious exerciſe, yet vpō occaſion of the almes there given, goe thither to receive it in the Winter, one Working day in the Week, from the hands of the Magiſtrates deputies: to ſay there is no aifference betweene

Hoc. Ainſ.

tween these things, argueth want of iudgement.

To the 2. difference which we put, between the benevolence of a Church to the saincts, (the sacrifice spoken of Phil. 4. 18.) and the releef of a citie, give to all poor people without respect of their religion:

Heb. 13. 16. Gal. 6. 10. 2. Cor. 9. 13

you answer, the benevolence given to the poore of any Religion, is "a sacrifice, &c. And this almes is not the releef of a citie, but chiefly "of a Church, collected publickly every Lords day, in the congregation of "the Saints, &c.

Repl. First, for the scriptures which you cite, they imply private benevolence also, and not publik onely: so upon this your doctrine, it seemeth that if any of your people should for their necessitie receive private almes of papists or other heretiks, they should not receive a civil benevolence but an Ecclesiastical, and so have a Religious communion with their sacrifices. If thus you think, I pray you tell me in your next. Secondly, you say not wel nor rightly, that this is not the releef of a citie, (as we oppose Citie or politicall estate, to Church or Ecclesiastical estate) For 1. the Magistrats of the citie, are not necessarily of the Church, but onely such as will. 2. This collection is not by the appointment of the Church (who have an ecclesiastical collection by their Deacons,) but by the appointmēt of the Magistrate. 3. They collect it not from the Church onely in their congregation, but from all the citie also, by every street and house, of all the inhabitants that wil give: of which not one among many, are members of the Church. 4. They collect it not for the Church, but for the citie: and so for the poore of the Church, not considered as members of the Church, but as members of the common wealth. 5. The distributors appointed by the Magistrates, are not necessarily members, much lesse Deacons of the Church. 6. And they to whom it is distributed, are the poore of all sorts, not in respect as they are members of any Church: but as they are poore and dwelt for a time in the citie. These things some of them my self know, the rest I have heard of such as are better acquainted with the State, to be certainly true. Now let all that know what politicall and ecclesiastical meaneth, judge between you and vs, of what nature this benevolence is.

To our 3. difference, between the solemne appointed worship of God

God by the Church, & the private duties of thankfulnes, salutation, &c "
you say, the duties of godly thankfulnes and blessing in the name of the "
Lord are and ought to be here performed: and that they are not pri- "
vate duties but publik, as is this almes, &c. Ianswer: By this your plea, you would seem to prove an ecclesiastical communion in publick prayer, which the dutch Church of this citie should have with all the poore in the towne; even the most irreligious, profane and heretical. And would you thus grace their communion to disgrace our poore? But indeed, you manifestly turne away from the matter in hand. For you deny not the difference which we put, neyther in trueth can you. And as for any publik blessing, it is knowen that the Magistrates deputies performe this busines without any publik prayer or blessing, eyther before or after. Neyther do they require of all or any of the people any prayer or blessing publick or private: neyther doe the people performe it otherwise then by thankfull obeysance of ech one that receiveth it: as is vsually doen at other times, and in other places of the citie, for like favours.

Vnto the question made in that book, about the lawfulnes to walk up and down in idol-temples, as they vse in Paules, &c. You answer: that in idol temples where idolservice is stil ordinarily performed, we cannot lawfully walk up and down, as men vse to doe in Pauls: for woe is denounced to men by whom [b] scandals doe come. Repl. Be- [b] Mat. 18.7 hold how you who keep Idolies to worship God in (as Antichrist consecrated them to that end,) and have so pleaded before for those nurseries of idolatrie: can now against others, denounce woe, as causing scandals even for walking up and down in hem. But by this your answer it seemeth that eyther the temples in Rome and Spaine, where ordinarily Masse is sung, are in your judgment no idol-temples, nor their service idolatrie: or else, you think it vnlawfull to walk in those temples. If thus you hold, when you shall so signify, you shall hear what I wil further say vnto it: and to your question about Baals temple also.

Anſwer.

Io. Pa. TO convince you of partialitie in condemning our vſe of temples, I alledged your own vſe of the ſame, while your poore do alſo publiquely worſhip God in the ſame temples, if they do but publiquely bleſſe them in the name of God, of whom they do publiquely receive thoſe almes in ſuch places. And here I a refuted three diſtinctions which you vſe to excuſe your ſelves in this matter. I ſhewed the errour of your firſt diſtinction, in that you made the receyving of the almes in this place to be *occaſional*, and the worſhip of the Church to be *ordinary*, &c. Now you anſwer, that *the publique worſhip of the Church is eccleſiaſtical, the almes here ſpoken of, is political & civil, &c.* And hereynto I reply. 1. I do not herein ſo much blame your manifeſt errour & ignorance, your want of judgement in the diſtinction as you made it at firſt, as I do now blame your want of vpright and honeſt dealing in changing and altering the diſtinction, in putting *political and civil* in ſtead of *occaſional:* As there is a plaine difference betwixt betwixt Eccleſiaſticall and political, ſo is there alſo betvvixt *politicall* & *occaſional*: for many things are political which are not occaſional, but ordinary: let all men of knowledge, be judges. 2, vvhereas you ſay that *people of all religion or of no religion* do receive this almes, this doth not excuſe the falſhood of your firſt diſtinction in making the almes to be *occaſional:* for even atheiſts or heretiques or ſchiſmatiques that never go thither to heare the word of God, may yet obſerve an ordinary & ſet time of the almes, and be willing to receive the ſame in a publique & ſolemne maner & not onely occaſionally. 3. Though it were very groſſe, if you ſhould plainely affirme that this almes here ſpoken of was occaſional; yet to colour the matter a little you vſe an abſurd phraſe which might inſinuate as much vnto the ſimple, in ſaying of the poore that *vpon occaſion of the almes there given*, they go thither to receive it, &c. for you might as wel ſay touching the publique ordinary worſhip of the

aSee before pag. 27.

the Church, that *vpon occaſion of the word preached* the godly go to heare, &c. And where then is your difference betwixt *occaſionall and ordinary?* 4, I will make eyen your ſelf judge of the matter: for when you ſpeak without preiudice & co tion, then you do rightly interpret this word *occaſional* and to expound b *occaſionally deliuered* to be *offred by chance*. *In exam ple whereof is ſet downe in Deut. 19. 5.* And ſo according to your owne expoſition of the word, this almes cannot be *occaſionall*, ſeing it is not an vnexpected thing that is by accident or chance received, but an ordinary, ſolemne thing purpoſely given and ſought for at an appoynted time & place.

b Arnot on Exo. 21. 13.

In the refutation of your ſecond diſtinction, the firſt thing which I c noted in oppoſition thereynto was, that *not onely the benevolence given to the miniſters or Saints of Chriſte, but that alſo which is given to the poore of any religion whatſoever, one or other, is a ſervice and d ſacrifice of ſweet odour, &c.* And what have you ſayd hereynto? 1, in repeating my reply, you leave out thoſe words *not onely*, which ſhewed the very poynt wherein I oppoſed your anſwer, and ſay nothing at all vnto it: but ſmoothly paſſe it over without any defence: I deſire the reader to obſerve your cunning therein. 2, In ſtead of anſwering that which was plainely ſet downe, you make enquirie about a deviſed thing *ſeeming* ſo vnto you which is not ſet downe nor meant at all: you aſk me whether I think that if any of our people for their neceſſitie ſhould receive private almes of Papiſts or other heretiques they ſhould not receive a civil benevolence but an eccleſiaſticall, &c. VVherevnto I anſwer that I do not thinke they ſhould receive an eccleſiaſticall benevolence: yea further if our people ſhould privately joyne with ſuch in prayer vnto God, yet would I not account this an eccleſiaſticall communion or action. And though the ſcriptures I cited may be applyed to private benevolence alſo and not publique onely: yet doth not the citing of them imply that I think private benevolēce to be an eccleſiaſticall matter. what meane you to runne away from queſtion by ſuch vaine ſhifts?

cSee before pag. 27.

dHeb. 13. 16 Gal. 6. 10. 2. Cor. 9. 13

The other thing which I noted in oppoſition to your ſecond diſtinction, was: that *this almes we ſpeak of is not the releefe of a citie, but cheefely the benevolence of a Church, &c.* Hereunto you reply that I ſay *not well nor rightly*, &c. Your reaſons are divers.

Firſt you ſay, *the Magiſtrates of the citie are not neceſſarily of the Church, but onely ſuch as will.* I anſwer, 1. This hinders not but the almes ſpoken of may be cheefely the benevolence of a Church: even as other actions may be actions of the church, though the Magiſtrates be not of the Church. Shew I pray you, how this your propoſition may be applyed againſt my aſſertion. 2, what if the Magiſtrates here were all neceſſarily of the Church? ſhould this make the almes to be then the benevolence of the Church? ſhould this either further or hinder the thing in queſtion? your looſe allegation can no way be applyed vnto this matter, either one way or other.

Secondly you ſay, *this collection is not by the appointment of the Church (who have an other eccleſiaſticall collection by their deacons) but by the appointment of the Magiſtrate.* I anſwer, that there be many eccleſiaſticall actions, which are done by the appoyntmēt of the Magiſtrate, as the holding of an eccleſiaſticall Synod: the obſervation of ſolemne and religious faſts not by the appoyntment of the Church but of the Magiſtrate: yea the ordinary worſhip of God in preaching the word and other ſervices here are and [e] ought to be commanded by the Magiſtrates: And now according to your vnſound reaſoning theſe and ſuch like actiōs ſhould not be eccleſiaſticall. You ought to have conſidered that as in theſe ſo in the almes ſpoken of, becauſe they are adminiſtred publiquely of the Church and at the exhortation of the miniſters going with the ſame, they may therfore be called the benevolence of a Church, though appoynted by the Magiſtrates.

[e] 2. Chro. 8. 14. & 14. 4.

Thirdly you plead that *they collect it not from the Church onely in their congregation, but from all the citie alſo, by every ſtreet and houſe*, &c. I anſwer, 1. In that this almes is ordinarily and publi-

publiquely gathered every Lords day in the congregation, and that the greateſt part thereof is collected in this ſolemne maner in the Church, the other collection in the ſtreets being but ſeldome in compariſon of this; this is enough to confirme as much as I affirme, namely that this almes is *not the releefe of a citie but cheefely the benevolence of a Church, &c.* All reaſon requires that ech thing ſhould receive denomination of that which is principall and cheef therein. 2, even that which the deacons diſtribute is by them collected for a great part thereof, of ſuch as are no members of the Church: and this not onely in reſpect of the ſtrangers which come into their congregations, but alſo privately collected from ſuch as dayly get ſome thing into the poore mans box vpon occaſion of bargianes with whoſoever. And thus according to your reaſoning that which the deacons diſtribute ſhould be the releef of a citie, & not cheefely the benevolence of a Church, becauſe they do not collect it from the church onely in their congregation, &c. 3, even that almes which is collected in your owne Church, is not from the members of your Church onely: but though an 100, ſtrangers, infidelles in your account, come into your congregation and ſhould publiquely contribute with the reſt into your Church treaſure (though it was heretofore [f] condemned by H. Barow) yet do you now accept and allow the ſame. If this almes thus receyved among you be eccleſiaſticall, then have you no reaſon to deny this other almes we ſpeak of, to be the benevolence of a Church, in reſpect of the perſons from whom it is collected.

[f] Reformation of Gift. p. 147.

Fourthly, you argue, that *they collect it not for the Church, but for the citie: and ſo for the poore, &c.* I anſwer, that it may be an Eccleſiaſtical almes if it be collected of the Church, though not for the Church. As thoſe prayers which are publiquely made by the Church for ſtrangers, and for ſuch as are no members of the Church, are to be accounted an Eccleſiaſticall ſervice, and a worſhip of the Church, though they be made not for the Church, but for the citie, for frendes or enimies without: even

[g] Ezr. 6. 10. Ier. 29. 7. Mat. 5. 44. 1. Tim. 2. 1. 2.

The other thing which I noted in oppoſition to your ſecond diſtinction, was: that *this almes we ſpeak of is not the releefe of a citie, but cheefely the benevolence of a Church, &c.* Hereunto you reply that I ſay *not well nor rightly*, &c. Your reaſons are divers.

Firſt you ſay, *the Magiſtrates of the citie are not neceſſarily of the Church, but onely ſuch as will.* Ianſwer, 1. This hinders not but the almes ſpoken of may be cheefely the benevolence of a Church: even as other actions may be actions of the church, though the Magiſtrates be not of the Church. Shew I pray you, how this your propoſition may be applyed againſt my aſſertion. 2, what if the Magiſtrates here were all neceſſarily of the Church? ſhould this make the almes to be then the benevolence of the Church? ſhould this either further or hinder the thing in queſtion? your looſe allegation can no way be applyed vnto this matter, either one way or other.

Secondly you ſay, *this collection is not by the appointment of the Church (who have an other eccleſiaſticall collection by their deacons) but by the appointment of the Magiſtrate.* Ianſwer, that there be many eccleſiaſticall actions, which are done by the appoyntmēt of the Magiſtrate, as the holding of an eccleſiaſticall Synod: the obſervation of ſolemne and religious faſts not by the appoyntment of the Church but of the Magiſtrate: yea the ordinary worſhip of God in preaching the word and other ſervices here are and [e] ought to be commanded by the Magiſtrates: And now according to your vnſound reaſoning theſe and ſuch like actiōs ſhould not be eccleſiaſticall. You ought to have conſidered that as in theſe ſo in the almes ſpoken of, becauſe they are adminiſtred publiquely of the Church and at the exhortation of the miniſters going with the ſame, they may therfore be called the benevolence of a Church, though appoynted by the Magiſtrates.

[e] 2. Chro. 8. 14. & 14. 4.

Thirdly you plead that *they collect it not from the Church onely in their congregation, but from all the citie alſo, by every ſtreet and houſe*, &c. Ianſwer, 1. In that this almes is ordinarily and publi-

publiquely gathered every Lords day in the congregation, and that the greateſt part thereof is collected in this ſolemne maner in the Church, the other collection in the ſtreets being but ſeldome in compariſon of this; this is enough to confirme as much as I affirme, namely that this almes is *not the releefe of a citie but cheefely the benevolence of a Church, &c.* All reaſon requires that ech thing ſhould receive denomination of that which is principall and cheef therein. 2, even that which the deacons diſtribute is by them collected for a great part thereof, of ſuch as are no members of the Church: and this not onely in reſpect of the ſtrangers which come into their congregations, but alſo privately collected from ſuch as dayly get ſome thing into the poore mans box vpon occaſion of bargianes with whoſoever. And thus according to your reaſoning that which the deacons diſtribute ſhould be the releef of a citie, & not cheefely the benevolence of a Church, becauſe they do not collect it from the church onely in their congregation, &c. 3, even that almes which is collected in your owne Church, is not from the members of your Church onely: but though an 100, ſtrangers, infidelles in your account, come into your congregation and ſhould publiquely contribute with the reſt into your Church treaſure (though it was heretofore [f] condemned by H. Barow) yet do you now accept and allow the ſame. If this almes thus receyved among you be eccleſiaſticall, then have you no reaſon to deny this other almes we ſpeak of, to be the benevolence of a Church, in reſpect of the perſons from whom it is collected.

[f] Reaſon of Gift p. 147.

Fourthly, you argue, that *they collect it not for the Church, but for the citie: and ſo for the poore, &c.* Ianſwer, that it may be an Eccleſiaſtical almes if it be collected of the Church, though not for the Church. As thoſe prayers which are publiqnely made by the Churchg for ſtrangers, and for ſuch as are no members of the Church, are to be accounted an Eccleſiaſticall ſervice, and a worſhip of the Church, though they be made not for the Church, but for the citie, for frendes or enimies without: even

[g] Ezr. 6. 10. Ier. 29. 7. Mat. 5. 44. 1. Tim. 2. 1. 2.

so the almes collected of the Church in a solemne assembly on the Lords day, and given as a part of their publique service vnto God, are to be esteemed a benevolence of the Church or a Church-service, though they be collected for such as are in misery, though not of the Church; seing the Churches (as well as private persons) are h bound to shew mercy vnto them without.

h Esa. 58.7. Neh. 5.5. Heb. 13.2.3 1 Thes. 4. 12.

Fiftly, you argue that *the distributors appoynted by the Magistrats, are not necessarily members, much lesse deacons of the Church.* But where is the proofe of this consequence, that therfore this almes is not an Ecclesiasticall benevolence? If your Church should agree together publiquely to collect in your congregation and then to send the same almes vnto any in affliction, and not by any deacons or members of your Church but by some other honest and trusty persons without; should this almes now ceasse to be a Church-service, or an Ecclesiasticall bevevolence? VVhat colour of reason can you bring for this?

Sixtly, you say, *they to whom it is distributed, are the poore of all sorts, not in respect as they are members of any Church, but as they are poore and have dwelt for a time in the citie.* Ans. This reason is the same in effect with the 4th that went before, and an idle repetition of the same, and is before answered. And now I do willingly agree with you in this that all who know what political and ecclesiastical meaneth, judge betweene you and vs of what nature this benevolence is, and whether it be not as I sayd cheefly the benevolence of a Church, &c.

But suppose I should grant you, that this almes were merely civill, and not the benevolence of a Church, yet this doth nothing weaken our maine obiection against you: for 1. VVhether it be ecclesiasticall or civill, if your people do publiquely in the name of God blesse those that so mercifully distribute vnto them in an Idol-temple as you account it; then must you needes acknowledge, that there is a lawfull worshipping of God in an Idol-temple, which yet you condemne in all other churches of God. 2, you cannot deny but that this distribution of almes

almes which your people do receive in this temple, is a solemne publique action performed for the glory and service of God by them that administer: And do you then hold it more lawfull to communicate with such almoners as yourself note to be sometimes no mēbers of the Church, then to joyne in the service of God with a true Church in the same place? If it were an ecclesiasticall action of the deacons of the reformed dutch Church, distributing out of their Church treasurie as they do vnto the members of their owne Church, would you then cōdemne the members of your Church for receiving the same of them? 3. By your doctrine this temple where your poore receive this almes, ought to be ruinated, either burnt or otherwise broken downe, and so in your jndgement is vnlawfully reteyned even for this vse of distributing to the poore therein: Now if notwithstanding this vnlawfull reteyning hereof you can yet joyne with others in vsing this place to such purpose of distributing almes therein as it ought not to be employed vnto: why can you not as well joyne with others in the other vse of hearing Gods word therein? The i legal commandemēt of destroying Idol-temples, doth as wel abolish them from being almes houses as from being houses of prayer. And where then is your dispensation to vse them for receiving of almes, rather then for receyving of spirituall instructions therein? If you plead that your vse of them is onely a civil vse, so as meates sacrificed to Idols were to be reteyned: This cannot help you, because k things sacrificed to Idols need not to be burnt and abolished, but by your doctrine our temples should be abolished, and destroyed, and so consequently made vnfit to meet or assemble in even for civil vses. Awaken your conscience Mr. Ainsworth, and examine yourself, whether you be not guilty of partialitie, in these your contrary doctrines and practises, which cannot agree one with an other. And thinke that God knockes at the dore of your conscience by these admonitions: and despise not the counsell that is given vnto you in his name.

i Deut. 12. 1 3.

k 1. Cor. 10. 25.

As

As for your third distinction, *betweene the solemne appoynted worship of God by the Church, and the private dueties of thankfulnes salutation, &c.* I shewed that *this distinction also could not truely be applyed vnto the matter in hãd for the dueties of godly thankfulnes and blessing which are and ought to be here performed, are not private dueties but publique even as is this almes that is alwayes publiquely administred in the presence of a great multitude assembled together.* Hereunto you answer againe that *by this plea, I would seem to prove an Ecclesiasticall cõmunion in publique prayer, which the dutch Church of this citie should have with all the poore in the towne, even the most irreligious, profane and heretical, &c.* But for reply vnto this. 1. I observe how you againe leaving that which is plainely set downe, do faine matter for yourself to answer, and imagine a semblance, a *seeming* vnto you, which can by no meanes be justly collected from my words. For though I sayd, the poore do blesse publiquely in the name of the Lord those that distribute vnto them, yet doth not this prove a communion in publique prayer which the dutch church should have with all such. 2, though I had sayd much more: if I had sayd that the dutch Church had bene all present: that this almes had bene given by their deacons in their name: that there had bene solemne prayer conceived by the deacons at the delivery thereof: that all the poore had sayd Amen vnto it and againe blessed them publiquely in the name of the Lord, yet would not this inferre such an ecclesiasticall communion of the dutch Church with the profane & heretical poore, as you accuse me for going about to prove. Are not many irreligious, idolatrous and profane people oftentimes present at your ecclesiastical assemblies hearing your sermons, and saying Amen vnto your prayers: & doth this prove an ecclesiasticall communion of your Church withall those profane persons that receive instruction from you? where then is your separation? But if all this do not prove that you hold communion with such persons: then much lesse doth that which I sayd prove such a communion of the Dutch Church with the profane, as you would draw from my words.

3, neither do I mention this receyving of almes *to disgrace your poore*, as you mention it, but to reprove your partialitie, who seeking to disgrace and condemne all the Churches of Christ for the vse of their temples, do yet for your proffit allow your poore to vse the very same temples in receyving of almes.

You say further, that I *manifestly turne from the matter in hãd: for I deny not the difference which you put, neither in truth can.* But I pray you, is that to turne from the question, when I shewed that the difference or distinction which you brought *could not be truely applyed to this matter in hand*? And what though your difference alledged by you be true in itself: is it not reproofe & shame enough vnto you that it cannot be truely applyed vnto the present controversie? Is not the misapplication of a true distinction vnsound dealing, and an abusing of the reader? Though I deny not a difference betwixt solemne appoynted worship, and the private dueties of thankfulnes, salutation, &c. yet I deny that the blessing in the name of God whereof I spoke is any private thankfulnes or salutation: and what proffit can you then here make of this your distinction?

But you proceed and say, *As for any publique blessing, it is knowne that the Magistrates deputies performe this busines, without any publick prayer or blessing, either before or after.* I answer, 1, it is enough, for proofe of that I sayd, if the people receyving the almes do pray or blesse in the name of God, those that distribute vnto them: if your poore do so much at the receit thereof then do they openly and publiquely worship God in the place, which you account an Idol-temple. 2, as for the distributours of this almes, there is the lesse need for them to make any publique prayer, because they begin there distribution instantly and immediately after the sermon is ended, and after the publique prayers of the minister and the Church: which prayers being in the same place may also serve for the sanctification of the almes then distributed. And may not the consciences of your people be touched and smitten in themselves to consider how they stay out of the Church till all the

spirituall almes of instruction for the soule be distributed and ended, and then to come into the same place immediately, just when the corporall almes is to be reached forth vnto them? 3. The publique collection and giving of almes even in your owne Church after your sermon, is performed without any publique prayer or blessing made by your deacons, as is testifyed vnto me: doth it therfore ceass to be an ecclesiasticall and solemne part of Gods worship?

You say moreover, that *neither do they require of all or any of the people any prayer or blessing publique or private.* And what though the almoners require it not? yet as I shewed you before from divers [m] scriptures, God requireth this duety of publique thankesgiving and blessing in his name vpon such occasion. But those testimonies you passe by and say nothing at all vnto them.

[l] Pag. 26.
[m] Phil. 4. 19, 20. 2. Tim. 1. 16. 2. Cor. 9. 12. 13.

Againe you adde: *Neither do the people performe it otherwise then by thankfull obeysance of ech one that receyveth it, &c.* But this you say, is not true for all that receyve it: for there are some which vpon the receit do straightway open their mouthes and pray for a blessing and reward vnto those that give this almes vnto them: And so ought your people to do according to those short formes of prayer vsed in the scripture, [n] *The blessing of the Lord be vpon you:* or *We blesse you in the name of the Lord.* And besides, I propounded this obiection at first by way of suppositiō saying, if you will allow your people to blesse them in the name of the Lord, &c. And to this you answer nothing: Tell vs therfore at last: if your people should thus breefely call vpon the name of God for a blessing vpon those that minister publiquely vnto their wants at the same time, would you then be content?

[n] Psal. 129. 8. Ruth. 2. 4.

Touching your reply made vnto the answer which I gave vnto your question about walking vp and downe in Idol-temples I do observe further.

1. You say nothing at all in refutation of it: but onely wish me to *behold how I who keep Idolies to worship God in, &c. can now against*

against others, denounce Woe, as causing scandalles, even for Walking vp and downe in them: vvel, this I behold and hold to be most equall: considering that the temples I pleaded for, were such as are purged from Idolatry, and are not reteyned for that false worship wherevnto they were consecrated by Antichriste, but are become nurseries of true godlines: whereas the temples wherein the Idols and Idolatrous service are still reteyned and dayly practised, cannot lawfully be frequented nor walked in as men vnnecessarily vse to do in Pawles, &c. For those that should see you enter into such an Idol-temple, might easily conceive that you went to heare a masse therein, and so they be confirmed in errour, & you thereby incurre the [o] woe denounced by Christe against Scandalles.

[o] Mat. 18. 7

2. I may here justly admonish you to behold how you that cōdēne our vse of tēples purged frō Idolatry, do yet in a cōtrary extreme allow your people a vse of tēples, which by your professiō are still polluted with the practise of dayly Idolatrie: evē the tēples of this citie are in your accoūt Idol-tēples, &: .e read prayr vsed therin, is in your eyes a detestable Idol, a goldē calfe, &c. yea in your writings you incline to allow your people the vse of the tēples where popish Idolatry is in heynous degree exercised

3. VVhereas you seeme to doubt whether I think that it is vnlawfull to vvalk in the temples in Rome and Spaine, vvhere ordinarily masse is sung: telling me also *that I shall heare What you will further say vnto it When I have signifyed vnto you, if thus I hold, &c.* All this is very vaine and idle, for vvhen I told you plainely before, as yourself also repeat, that *in idol-temples where idol-service is still ordinarily performed We cannot lawfully Walk vp and downe as men vse to do in Pauls*: was not this enough to signify that I held the temples of Rome and Spaine to be vnlawfull for such vse? or what colour of reason had you to imagine that I should not think the Romish and Spanish temples to be Idol temples and their service, idolatrie? This vaine demurre seemes to be nothing els but an excuse or shift to avoyd the writing of that which you were ashamed to

vtter concerning this poynt.

4. VVhereas I demanded the like thing of you, *Whether you held it lawfull for men so to have walked vp and downe in the house of Baal, and there to have receyved almes as your people do in these temples whereof we speak.* To this likewise you give no answer but take time to consider of it. VVell, in the meane time vntill you have taken better advise, see vvhat an vnworthy practise you already staine yourself vvithall. You that condemne our temples to be p *merely and properly idolies, yea very Idols:* you that condemne our reteyning of them for necessary vse, do yet for your proffit vse them to vvalke in, to receive almes in, &c. Though H. Barow vvrite that q *God allowes no vse at all either civill or ecclesiasticall of such Idolatrous places*: yet contrary to your profession you suffer your people to transgresse for a morsell of bread, by reteyning at least a civil vse of these places: In the middes of your invectives and dispute against them you allovv your disciples to go into these *abominable sties*, as Barovv r calles them: togather vp the crummes vnder the table in *Devilles houses*, as yourself do s call them. Is it not strange that Christian men, and such as separate from other best Christians in the world wheresoever, should yet be so familiar with devilles, as to creep into the bodies of *very Idols* or *Devilles*, to fetch their meate out of their vncleane stomackes and bellies? yea the Iewish Rabbines whom I mention, because you honour them so much, t teach that it is not lawful for an Israelite to receive any almes of an Idolater openly, vnlesse it be in case of necessitie, (which respect in our vse of temples you judge to be a carnal consideration.) And though a Prince or King of the gentiles should send any money vnto them for an almes, though they would not turne it back for peace sake, but receive it to avoyd offence, yet are they to give the same againe vnto some poore of the gentiles, in secret so that the King may not heare of it. How much more ashamed would they be to receive such an almes not onely from Idolaters openly, but from out of the publique Idolie, yea Idol itself, as you professe to doe?

p See before, p. 165.

q Discov. p. 134.

s Discov. p. 141.

r Before. pag. 318.

t Arba turim, halac. Tsedakah, or treat. of almes, sig. 254. Thalmud in Babha bathra c. 1. Fol. 10.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Touching the vvaverings of such as impugne our Temples.

TO your last observations, of such as heretofore have written against these idol-temples, and after that wavered, or changed their mindes: First, Mr. Barrow (whose Writings you mention) wavered not nor changed his mind, but was constant in this, that Idol-temples were to be destroyed: and not to be used for places of Gods worship: let his Writings be viewed. Heu. Anti.

As for others whom you speak of: if they have changed their mindes, I leave you if you please, to demande the reasons of themselves. I am to answer for my self, according to the grounds which I mainteine by the scriptures: which if yon cannot take away by the Word of God; the weaknes of men will litle availe you. And for such amongst our selves as walk not aright, we shall look vnto them as there is cause. If I should take this course with you to gather the varietie of things written about religion by men of your side, and the change of their judgments afterward, & their weak walkings, &c and put them vpon you to answer: you should have work more then ynough. And how justly you retort my words used to you about read prayer: and apply them to this of the Temples: let any indifferent persons judge. For I mainteine our reasons set down in our Apologie & refute your answers given vnto them: but with that question of read prayer, you medle not: though it came in among the synns shewed in my argument vnto you, about the causes of our separation.

Answer.

&c. Pa. FOure examples of your waverings were obserued by me. The first instance of H. Barow his wavering, you deny not, but do in part explane it: The peece of paper affixed to the u margent of his booke shewes it more plainely; that his minde became doubtfull if not changed in this poynt, namely, though he held our temples ought to be plucked downe, yet not with such detestation to be vtterly destroyed, as these Idols which had worship given vnto them, but that the idolatrous shapes being vtterly abolished, the stuffe of these synagogues, as the stone, tymber, lead, yron, &c. might be converted to civill and honest vses, &c. Now those that saw him wavering in this part and doubting whether he had detested where God hath not detested, had just cause to take warning hereby, that they should not rashly hearken to such a person who in all his writings powres forth a flood of detestation against the lawful communion of the Churches of Christe.

u Discov. p. 133.

The second and third instancee of *Mr Iohnsons* wavering, & *Mr. Robbinsons* recantation, you deny not. You leave me to demand the reasons of themselves: you say *you are to answer for yourself, &c.* But is not the case strangely altered? Have not both these laboured to answer for you; *Mr. Iohnson* in his answer to Mr. *White*, seeking to excuse & diminish the fault of your apostasy obiected to you; *Mr. Robinson* also in many poynts seeking to defend your cause in his book against Mr. Bernard? And have you now never a word to answer for them? Is not this ingratefull dealing with your frends? Nay rather take heed that you become not ingratefull vnto God, by neglecting his mercy which he shewes vnto you, in setting these examples of your old frends before you; that in them you might learne to turne from your errour vnto the Lord and to the communion of his people.

The fourth example of wavering which is obserued was in the

the people of your owne congregation, together with your toleration of the same. Of this you say, *And for such amongst our selves as walk not right, we shall look vnto them as there is cause.* But who sees not what a faint answer this is? for 1, when as I had shewed that divers of your people did not walk according to your profession: they frequenting the places which you call Idol-temples and teach men to avoyd them as execrable, as devilles houses: was there not a cause for you to look vnto such, who so long you had let alone? yea or have you to this houre brought them to publique repentance after so many yeares, when as they have publiquely and openly vsed such places? suppose they did now abstaine from those temples, yet according to your owne writing against me you are holden in the cords of your trangression, and this sin remaines vpon you till it be purged and broken of by repentance: your owne x allegations of scripture do serve to condemne yourself herein. As Cains murder cleaved vnto him so long as he repented not, suppose he slew no more men after Abel: so the guilt of this sin in frequenting devilles houses according to your profession, doth still cleave vnto you so long as there is no repentance for it, suppose the practise should ceasse. 2, But doth this practise ceasse among you? No not that also: VV. S. in speciall whom I before noted vnto you, is seene of many still openly and publiquely frequenting these temples which you so plead against: yea & professeth before divers that he will continue so to practise. I did before in my former writing manifest your notorious partialitie herein, and you cannot either deny or defend it: and yet after a yeares warning you continue in the same halting course, tolerating that among yourselves for which you separate from vs, and thus have doubled the guilt of your partiality: let all men of conscience judge what sincerity there is in your course. 3, what doth it help you by vaine arguments and pretences to seek the ruine and rasing of our temples, whiles other of your owne societie do do help to repaire our temples, as I shewed you y before? The stroke of your

vv See before. p. 36. & 121.

x Luk. 13. 3. 5. Mark. 11. 15. Act. 10. 21. & 26. 18.

y Pag. 29.

hammer

hammer makes a great ſound, yet it breakes nothing in our temples: but the ſtroke of ſome of your peoples hammers and axes have done good ſervice vnto vs in making our temple fit for our vſe. 4, as for your owne perſon in particular, do you not remember that you and Mr. Th. your elder have bene content to come vnto our temple, to preſent yourſelves before our Elderſhip, & to be examined and heard what you could ſay in an eccleſiaſticall controverſie in the caſe of C. B. to give evidence or light in the tryall of that matter? And therfore ſeing you confeſſe the triall and examination of ſuch cauſes to be
[a] Animad. verſ. p. 49. 50. [a] workes of the Sabath day, holy and religious actions, as well as the propheticall and prieſtly office of Chriſte, it may hereby appeare that you alſo by your owne example do build that which you ſeek to break downe, in that you have voluntarily come into an Idol-temple as you call it and this not for a civil but a holy and religious action. Thus alſo have ſundry others of your people done, in comming to beare witneſſe in ſuch caſes.

But you obiect, that if you *ſhould take this courſe with vs, to-gather the varietie of things written about religion by men of our ſide & the change of their judgements afterward, and their weak walkings, &c. put them vpon vs to anſwer: I ſhould have work more then ynough.* Anſwer. 1, whatſoever pretences you make to the contrary, yet is this thing done by yourſelf: and few or none have done it ſo much as you: Throughout your Counterpoyſon, there be abundant examples hereof. When you ſo bitterly inveigh againſt *the helliſh errors taught by the transformed miniſters, to make men keep communion with Belial*, as you ſpeak: you ſay, [a] *worthy it is to be obſerved how the miniſters of England are come to contradict and depart from their owne grounds for to mainteyne their corrupt eſtate.* And is it not alſo as lawfull & as worthy a thing for vs to obſerve how the miniſters of the ſeparation are come to contradict themſelves, to depart from their owne grounds, &c. you alledge, that [b] *men will hardly be a known of the manifold evills & groſs corruptions, that prevayl in their*

[a] Foreſpeech to the Counterpoyſ.

[b] Ibidem.

their aſſemblies: That *therfore you are forced to produce their owne writers to witneſs with you: to complayne of the ſins that reigne among them.* Even ſo becauſe you will hardly be a known of the manifold evills and groſs corruptions that prevayl in your aſſemblie, therfore are we forced to produce your owne writers as Mr. Iohnſon & Mr. Robinſon that complayn of the ſins that reign among you, &c. And this we do, to this end, (to vſe your owne words in the ſame place) that *if you will yet reſiſt, the world may ſee, that you are condemned by your ſelves.* Againe in the next leafe vnto your preface, in the Table or *Direction to ſome principall things conteyned* in your counterpoyſon, you note the *Teſtimonies of the miniſters of England againſt the eſtate of that Church*, and refer vs vnto more places and pages of your book for thoſe teſtimonies, then vnto any other matter in your table: hereby you acknowledg ſuch teſtimonies to be among the *principall things* of your writings, & to be looked after & ſought for oftener and in more places of your booke, then any other principall matter conteyned therein. In your anſwer to Mr. B. you c note his changing and weak walking, &c. Shall theſe obſervations in you be *principall* matters; and ſhall they be of no regard, of no worth, nor yet to be endured, when we obſerve the like matters againſt you? 2, there is not the like reaſon that I ſhould be required to anſwer for all the differences and contradictions that have bene or are betwixt the miniſters that are of the ſame religion with me: they being ſo many thouſands, and ſuch as for the moſt of them I never ſaw their faces nor ſo much as heard of their names; whereas theſe whom I obiect vnto you are but three or foure in all: and not onely ſo but ſome of them ſuch as have already anſwered for you: ſo that both for number and bond of thankfulnes, you both better may and ought to anſwer for them. 3, the thing which I obiect here vnto you is not ſo much your diſagreement and differences, as your inexcuſable and blinde partialitie in the ſame, whiles you ſuffer ſuch things amōg yourſelves for which you do condemne, diſclaime and renounce the communion of

[c] Counterp. pag. 153. 155.

other churches: This vnchristian dealing I shewed to be cõtrary
to d *the High Way of the vpright man*, which you had poynted
d prov. 16. 17. at with your finger. Mr. Ainsworth, if you can finde the like vnconscionable partialitie in me, then presse me with it, and call for answer: If I teach men to separate from the Churches of Christe, for those very things which I practise my self and wink at in others, then let me beare the shame of such evill dealing. In the meane time consider that this cloke of partialitie is the robe of confusion wherewith you aray and bewray yourself & your profession.

Moreover, as for Mr. H. his sermon, and how justly I retort your words to me vsed about read prayer, & apply them to the practise of Mr. Iohnson and Robinson contrary to you in the question of temples, I desire also with you, that any indifferent persons judge. For I vrge you with their practise which yourself cannot deny: you tell me of a matter which I have shewed to be otherwise. You tell me of read prayer which is not the question betwixt vs at this time; whereas I vrged you with your differences about the temples, which you cannot deny to be the present question betwixt vs. As for your reasons in your Apologie & my answers, and your disorderly bringing in of read prayer in your maine argument sent vnto me, there is enough sayde before, whereunto I refer the reader.

Cap. 2.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of some other differences.

Hen. Ainsw. "*TO the other things which I signified we misliked in you: you answer in general: that the question betwixt vs is not about all things wherin we differ, but onely about those things which we hold to be just causes of renouncing your communion. You say, Our separation or schisme is a double iniquitie and an errour of errors, &c. and you would have the face of our separation layd vnto the root of your religion, &c. and you account all other differences, to be a*

be a wandring from the question.

Hereupon I answer, that I am willing to hold onely vnto the mayn causes of our separation, and to let other particulars rest, til this question be ended. For as you began to write, so I gave you to choose, & stil give you, what things to reason of: & I mislike not your choise. For as I would not willingly abide in any error, so much lesse in an error of errors: though I am yet perswaded: it is your great syn so to call it: but let the Word of God be judge betweene vs. Now for our separation, I set you down an argument fortified with many scriptures & reasons: against which, you have not alleged any one word of God: let your former answer be viewed. So mine errour of errours if such it be, must remaine with me stil, for my conscience cannot be convinced but by the Word of God. You allege our renouncing of your communion: and that eyther is not (as before I shewed you) or it is as you stood one with the Church of England in the synns thereof, wherin we with you were all once intangled. But God of his grace hath given vs repentance vnto life, and we have manifested the particulars: you have not so doen, therfore (for ought that we know) your synns remaine vpon you. Yea you disclaime our separation as a schisme, in your pulpit, in private, and in printed Works: how can we now give you the right hand of fellowship, seing repentance from dead Works, is one of the a *principles of the doctrine of Christ? And for* a Heb. 6. 1.
this your particular congregation, here gathered, you cannot say we renounce it or separate from it, who were never of it: but if any separation be, I have before shewed it is first vpon your selves. I shal not need therfore at this time to make any reply vnto your particular answers vnto the differences propounded. Onely for the present, I put you in minde that you have not as yet alleged any one word of God for your festival dayes, mariage by the minister, consistorie, or communion of your members with an other Church, worship, ministerie, &c. so far differing from yours in appearance. But when these things shal come to discussing, I hope you will not be so barren. So for the differences that you allege from vs, touching mariage with the members of the Dutch church, mariages and divorces without authoritie of the Magistrate, judging of ecclesiastical causes on the Lords day,

day, omitting and thrusting out in part sometimes the administration of the word & Sacraments, and for the ministers set maintenance: in the trial of them I shall by Gods grace manifest, that in the most we are wronged: and for that which we doe hold in any of them, we will confirm it by the word of God, and reason from the same, otherwise, we will reforme it.

Answer.

Io. Pa. TOuching 3 other differences betwixt vs: I noted divers things distinctly: vnto which you make a confused and defective reply: vnto my first answer, you say something vnto the two last, nothing at all. For the first, you seeme to allow my choise, that we hold onely vnto the maine causes of your separation, &c. but I spake not of the *maine* causes, but of the *just* causes of your separation, whether great or small; so that you leave the matter in some vncertainty still, not shewing me which and how many you hold for *iust* causes, when I had nominated sundry differences betwixt vs. You say, *you set downe an argument for your separation fortifyed with many scriptures, &c.* And I have shewed the contents of your maine argument, to be beside the question of our Church: and there is no place of scripture which I can discerne to be alledged against our estate in particular, but I have given answer therevnto. And for our particular congregation, though you were never of it, yet may we justly say that you have renounced the communion thereof, and not onely as we agree with England but as we agree with these Churches: for you that had separated yourself from all the true Churches long before this our particular Church was gathered; and you that do still renounce and refuse the worship of God in such temples as we vse, (if there were nothing els) do thereby renounce communion with vs in our ordinary worship of God. That we have just cause to disclaime your separation as a schisme; I have laboured to shew in some part in this treatise, and will endevour to

make it yet more plaine, as the Lord shall give strength and opportunitie. And if there were nothing els, your allegation of this scripture *Heb. 6. 1.* might shew vs your schisme: when having spoken of our standing one with England; of your owne repentance for it; of our sins remayning vpon vs, &c. you say, *how can we give you the right hand of fellowship, seing repentance from dead workes, is one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ?* The substance of this obiection hath bene twise largely answered before: yet since you repeat it againe, I do againe tell you, 1. If it were granted that our communion with Englād were a sin, yet might we have true repentance though we could not see the same to acknowledge it. Your contrary plea savours of the errour of the perfectionists and enclines to familisme: for if true repentance cannot be without the knowledge of every particular sin, then do you teach a perfection of knowledge contrary to the g scriptures: If true repentance may be had without the knowledge of of each particular sin, then why not without the knowledge of this sin as well as of others? The Apostle shewes that *repentance from dead workes* h is necessary to salvation, but he doth not deny that to be true repentance, where there is ignorance of some particular dead works that are in vs: this holy scripture is therfore abused by you. 2, suppose that we were without true repentance, yet where is the scripture, that shewes our Church ought therfore to be separated from? The sin of some doth not pollute the rest which approve not thereof. 3, whereas in my second answer i before I noted as great differences among yourselves, as these 3. last be wherein you differ from vs; notwithstanding your vnconscionable course might thereby appeare vnto all, in holding such communion among yourselves as you deny in others: yet as if either partialitie were no blot, but a beautifull wart in the face of your Church: or els as if you dispaired of washing away this blot, even so do you passe by this matter in silence without any reply vnto it.

f Chap. 4. & 6.

g 1 Cor 8. 2 & 13. 9.

h Heb. 6. 1.

i Pag 31.

VVhereas you put me in minde that I have not as yet alled-

ged any one word of God for our festivall dayes, mariage by the minister, consistorie, and communion of our members with an other Church, &c. I answer, that seing you are the accuser, that maintaine a separation from vs in these respects, the salt is yours that have not brought any word of God to conclude a separation from vs vpon these grounds: Though in your Apologie you have pretended scripture to shew some of these things vnlawfull, yet have you not directed any reasons against our communion for these things: even as in your Apologie you have pretended scripture against our vse of the Lords prayer, & yet confesse that you would not separate for this. As for our communion with England I have sayd enough before Chap 4. & 6. so far as concernes separation from vs vpon such a pretence. As for our consistorie or Eldership, I shewed in my former writing how you have allowed it your self in communicating therewith, and you have answered not a word vnto it. Now those that refute themselves on this maner, have no reason to call for further refutation, vnlesse they acknowledge their errours in such practises. Besides seing you have not yet answered, neither the [k] first nor the last booke of Mr. Johnson wherein he hath written against your popular government, what meane you to call for more? If more be requisite, you may see that I [*] promised you in my former writing that when I should receive any arguments from you to prove your refusal of communion vpon these grounds, that I would then give further answer vnto you. The errours which you have published in your *Animadversion* for the maintenance of your popular order, and the enormities which in that order are committed by you in your vnlawfull excommunications and censures are so many that they require a distinct treatise for the refutation thereof: of which I purpose to say more hereafter as occasion is given. As for the state of the question and what we hold in these matters, I have set it downe in my former writing, and to this poynt also you say nothing. Touching the other differences betwixt vs, which are here ambiguously repeated by you and

[k] Expos. of Mat. 18. 1 Christian plea.

[*] Pag. 33.

and not so that the reader might well vnderstand the meaning thereof, I am ready to manifest that I have not done you any wrong in the relation thereof; and that you cannot confirme any of them by the vvord of God: if you will bring any reasons to conclude a separation from thence.

CHAP. XIX.

The Conclusion.

VNto your Conclusion I willingly assent, and by Gods grace shal endeavour so to doe: wishing the like in you. And vpon this occasion I shal put you in minde of that which in part appeareth in this your writting, and more fully in the disguised pamphlets that come out of your congregation: how you take a speciall delyte and think it for your vantage, to vpbraid mens differences, to rake into particular mens synns and infirmities, yea though they be repented of, and to blazon them abroad to the world, for the discredit of the cause which they professe, or have professed. If the arrowes of the Almighty did stick fast in you, & you felt your owne miserie: you would not write after this manner. If a Iew or Iulian apostata should gather and publish all the open professed differences in Christendom, yea among them that err from the trueth: what would this tend vnto, but to the disgrace of Christ; and yet help Iudaisme nothing. But if the contentions and particular synns, I say not of all Christendom, but of England or the Churches in Netherland, or the like, which you acknowledge true Churches, were thus blazoned: what a sink of yll savour would be smelt. And are there no personal synns amongst your selves may vve think: that you take such a course. If God herein should reward you according to your works, where should you appeare? I counselt you therfore to take a better course. Errour may be refuted by the word of God, without any such leaven of maliciousnes: and the truth needeth no such fleshly meanes to maintcine it. If you like not of this counsel: you may walk on in the light of your fyre, and in the sparks that you have kindled: but my soule shal not come into your se- Hen. Ainsc.

cret:

cret: though I ſhal not ceaſe to wiſh your welfare, ſo long and ſo far as I may.

November 9. 1617. *Henry Ainſworth.*

Anſwer.

10. Pa. WHereas you take occaſion from the Concluſion of my former writing, to complaine againſt me that I *think it for our vantage, to vpbrayde mens differences, &c.* I cannot but marvell at your ſtrange partialitie, where with you begin, continue and end this your writing: for have not you yourſelf firſt endevoured to ſeek advantage by
m Fol. 4 B. m vpbrayding me with the difference of M^r. *Hu.* from me, which I ſhewed to be otherwiſe? Have you not vpbrayded me with the difference of the courts of England wherevnto when as I had given you divers answers, you reply not a word? And
n Pag. 33. beſides many other differences of men which you vrge me with all in this writing, your other bookes do much more abound with the ſame, as I have ſhewed before. Remēber what Barow
o Diſc. v. p. 184. & 162. refu. of Gr. p. 138. 39. ſaith of the miniſters of England of *the* o *particular perſonal errours, which they in their publique doctrine and dayly miniſterie ſparſe abroad, even as that flood of bitter waters, &c. that there ariſe ſuch an innumerable heap of errours, ſo many divers, variable, inconſtant & contrarie opinions amongſt them, that (as the ignorant Papiſts ſay) it is impoſſible to finde two of them in one mind and judgement, yea in any two Churches of the land to heare the ſame doctrines becauſe indeed they preach either their owne dreames and phantaſies, or els their lucubrations out of humane vvritings, &c. Thus hath God in his juſt judgement devided the tongues and confounded the language of theſe Babyloniſh builders, that they almoſt agree not in or vpon any thing: one preaching one thing, an other the quite contrary; one building after this ſort, an other after that: one calling for this law, this thing, an other for that. Thus is their Kingdome devided, their eſtate confuſed, and their houſe ſhall ſhortly be left vnto them deſolate.*

deſolate. Now vvhen thus you vvrite and print yourſelves, touching mens differences, and propheſy of deſolation to enſue therevpon; with what forehead can you condemne in others, this very thing which you commend in your owne practiſe? yea the differences as you record them are ſlanderouſly & vntruely ſet downe, but the differences which I note are ſuch as you cannot deny any one of them; and ſhall you have more liberty to publiſh falſhood, then we to ſpeak truth?

As for the publiſhing of the notorious ſcandalles of ſuch as continue in ſchiſme, and labour dayly to ſeduce men from the Church of God: (which you call *a raking into particular mens ſyns and infirmities*) you have not brought any one word of God to refute this courſe: Had you done it, I doubt not but I ſhould then have ſhewed how you had perverted the ſame. How can men beware of ſchiſmes, and diviſions; of offences & ſcandalles committed in the ſame, as the Apoſtle p requires, vnleſſe they p Rom. 16. 17. 18. have warning and intelligence thereof? Are vve not taught to Iude. 17. look vpon the lives and q walking of men, that profeſſe to be 18. 19. our guides? If need were I might produce vnto you a multi- q Phil. 3. 2. 17. 18. 19. tude of examples from all ſtories divine and humane, of the r Tim. 4. ages paſt and of the time preſent, and even your owne exam- 14 15. & ples both againſt others and againſt yourſelves, for your convi- 3. 1 vii. ction herein. But this would require a whole volume: and more needes not, while ſo litle is alledged againſt it. Your maine ſins and ſcandalles, are not repented of, as you would inſinuate: the vnlawfull excommunications, and the notorious ſlanders publiſhed by you are not recalled: if ſome other faults be acknowledged by ſome, yet while you ſtand in open defiance againſt all the Churches of Chriſte, and proclaime a ſeparation from them all, is there not a cauſe to proclaime and blazon the iniquities of ſuch deceivers, that the ſimple may take the more heed? you ſpeak of *diſguiſed pamphlets that are come out of our congregation*: but the bookes which you ſeeme to ayme at, are ſuch as for the matter of them are taken out of your offenſive company, and do in part ſhew the diſguiſed practiſes of your

separation: for the persons that publiſhed them, they alſo were ſuch as came out of your company, who leaving their ſchiſme, which they once profeſſed with you, were more fit to vvitneſſe ſuch things as they had heard and ſeene among you: for the helpers, which they had herein, they had (beſides others) Mr. Th. now an Elder of your congregation alſo (but then a deacon) out of vvhoſe vvriting vvhich he communicated vvith them, they receyved ſundry things vvhich they publiſhed, and many more vvhich ſhould have bene publiſhed, had not their book bene miſprinted contrary to their mindes: for the maner of printing and publiſhing one of thoſe bookes, great injury hath bene done vnto them, as hath bene noted before.

1 The Hunting of the foxe. part. 1.

You ſay, *If the arrowes of the Almighty did ſtick faſt in me, & I felt mine owne miſery: I would not write after this maner.* But on the contrary, the more I feele mine ovvne miſerie, the more carefull ought I to be to deliver others from their miſerie alſo: and the declaration of the manifold evilles committed in your ſeparation, being a meanes and help to pluck ſome out of the fire and to ſave them from your miſerable ſchiſme, therfore ſhould this meanes be the more diligently vſed in ſuch caſe. If you on the other ſide did feele your owne miſery as you ought, you vvould not exalt yourſelf with the ſ bramble above all the trees of the foreſt, againſt all the Churches of God on earth as though none were vvorthy of your fellowſhip: if you had true ſenſe and feeling of your owne ſcandalles, you vvould be more humble & not maintaine ſuch a vaine ſeparation. Hawty Edom had his neſt among the ſtarres: but a neſt among the ſtarres will not content you: There is no communion with the worthieſt miniſters, the t lights and ſtarres of the Churches, that you can avvay vvith: Therfore have you got a higher ſphere of ſeparation above them all. But remember that the wandring ſtarres are u drawne from the heaven, remember that you among the reſt have often fallen from your orb by Apoſtaſy: know yourſelf at length, that you fall not further.

ſ Iudg 9. 16 ſp 20

t Rev. 1. & 2.

u Rev. 12. 4

You obiect, that *if a Iew or Iulian apoſtata ſhould gather and publiſh all the open profeſſed differences in Chriſtendome, yea among them that erre from the truth: What vvould this tend vnto, but to the diſgrace of Chriſt: and yet help Iudaiſm nothing, &c.* I anſ. er, 1. Suppoſe this would help Iudaiſm nothing, but be a further occaſion of offence vnto Infidelles, yet might it be a great help vnto the weak Chriſtians that were already members of a true Church to preſerve them from the wayes of falſe Chriſtians, vvhen they ſaw their differences and contradictions. 2. This might alſo tend vnto the honour of Chriſte, to have falſe Chriſtes and falſe Chriſtians diſcovered, and might help the elect Iewes to bring them vnto true Chriſtians, and keep them from Antichriſte. Yea when the time of their viſitation is come, that the Iewes ſhalbe called and grafted in againe, this knowledge of the differences among Chriſtians, may be a great meanes to direct them vnto the truth: for the godly ſhall riſe by that thing vvhereat others ſtumble. 3, if it be an vnlawfull thing to publiſh the open and profeſſed differences of Chriſtendome, then is yonr ſin great in this behalf, as I have ſhewed already, and might eaſily bring an 100. more examples & inſtãces to prove the ſame: as for *Iulian the apoſtata*, though his apoſtaſy was the deeper, yet is he the glaſſe of your evill, & you may name him and thinke of him with feare and trembling: for the number of apoſtaſyes, I think you cannot ſhew that he hath apoſtate and fallen from his profeſſion ſo often as you have done: and as for contempt of the Church of God and true Chriſtians, for which he is moſt infamous, I dare vndertake to manifeſt that your ſeparation hath publiſhed more reproches and ſlanders of them, then you can ſhew that he hath done. 4. As for the contentions aud particular ſins of true Churches, whether would a Ievv or Turk be more offended to heare of ſome vvicked and vnchaſt perſons in your company: or to heare you ſay of the Church of England, that *vvthere is not almoſt one among them that hath his wife chaſt, or their bed private*: vvhether vvould be a greater ſtumbling block vnto them to heare the ſcandalles of your company reproved: or to heare you

vv H. Bar. diſcov. p. 182.

x Inquir. of T. VVh. p.26.

you affirme that x *you could not vvithout apoſtaſy ſo much as heare the Word of God preached in any of the Reformed dutch and French Churches, if they be like vnto thoſe in this citie?* VVhether would a Iulian more triumph and be hardned againſt Chriſtianitie to heare of your apoſtaſy: or to heare you affirme (if he did with all beleeve it,) that y *the reforming preachers were the greateſt deceyvers of the people, vnder ſhew of holynes*: and that *it is a bleſſed Work of God that the moſt dangerous ſeducers ſhould thus firſt be diſcovered.* Had you conſcience of the things that tend to the diſgrace of Chriſt and Chriſtianitie, then would you be humbled for theſe your writings, and revoke them with ſpeed.

y Counter- p.168.

Againe you aſk, *And are there no perſonal ſins amongſt yourſelves may we think, that you take ſuch a courſe? If God herein ſhould reward you according to your Works, where ſhould you appeare? &c.* Anſw. VVe acknowledge our ſins to be innumerable, & all our owne righteouſnes to be as a defiled garment, and have no where to appeare ſave vnder the righteouſnes of Chriſte: but if according to your example, in the middes of our ſins we ſhould lift vp our heads ſo high, as to diſclaime the fellowſhip of ſuch as are farr better then our ſelves, yea of all the faithfull congregations in the vvorld: vvhere ſhould vve then appeare? If in the middes of my corruption, I ſhould exalt my miniſterie as onely lavvfull to be communicated vvith, and teach the godly to abandon and ſeparate from al other miniſters vvhereſoever, as you doe: where ſhould I then appeare? Then might I feare as *Mr. Robinſon* notes concerning you in the refutation of your priuate ſchiſme, that z *God vvould be provoked to ſuffer vs to fall into ſuch perſonall ſins and evilles from vvhich thouſands of others have bene preſerved*, &c. Then vvere it moſt juſt that theſe perſonall ſins and ſcandalles ſhould be publiſhed for a warning to others, to keep them from the like preſumption. This is the poynt, which you cover and hide in your reaſonings. This I deſire that every Modeſt Chriſtian would conſider and judge of. And as for you, vvhere think you to appeare in the day of Chriſte? among the goats on

z Relig. comm. p. 5.

on the left hand you think not: among the ſheep on the right hand vvith vs, it is contrary to your preſent ſeparation from vs. If you expect a place in the Church triumphant, according to the place vvhich you take vnto yourſelf on earth, ſeparated from all the Churches militant here: then muſt you alſo look for ſome ſolitary place in heaven, ſeparated from the common Saints, and exalted above the reſt.

As for your counſell to me; it is ſuch as Chriſt Ieſus hath taught me not to embrace: for he hath taught vs to bevvare of errour, & to knovv falſe teachers the better, by their ſcandalous and vvicked practiſes, vvhich he a publiſheth vnto men; This his practiſe in your language, is the leaven of malicioufnes and a fleſhly meanes. My purpoſe and endevour is to followv him that is light it ſelf vvalking in the middes of his golden candleſticks, vvhither you refuſe to followv him. Into the ſecret of your ſeparation let not my ſoule enter: yea let every ſoule bevvare of that myſterie of iniquitie, vvhich as a vvilde fire conſumes the communion of Saints and their loving ſocietie. By this ſchiſme you have ſhut out your ſelf from the ſecret of the righteous, and from their aſſemblie. The Lord ſhevv mercy vnto you in rayſing you out of this pit, and keep the feet of his Saints from falling into this or the like ſnare. Farevvell in the Lord.

a Mat. 13. 13, 14, &c. 2 Pet. 2. 3. 10, &c. Rev. 9. 7, 8, &c.

Decemb. 6. 1618. *John Paget.*

AN ADMONITION Touching TALMVDIQVE and RABBINICAL ALLEGATIONS.

Mr. *Ainsworth*, *it was much beyond my expectation, when as I met with your allegations of Rabbines against me in this controversy: Hereupon I enquired after your annotations on Genesis and Exodus, which before this time, I had not seene; & there I saw them so frequently alledged, with such pompe of glorious titles, and vndeserved honour given vnto them that I supposed both the puritie and sufficiencie of the holy scriptures to be much eclypsed and empaired thereby. For this cause I have thought it expedient to note some things concerning these authors, for help of the Christian readers that they may be the better able to discerne and judge of them.*

All vse of the Talmud I do not condemne: There is some vse of the Rabbines for vnderstanding and learning of the holy tongue: And a principall vse of them is, thereby to refute the Jewes themselves from their owne writings; and not them onely, but all such also as dote vpon their writings in such maner as you doe. And to this end have I alledged

ledged them against you, which otherwise I would not have done: It was far from my thoughts, when I first undertooke this controversie with you. Your maner of quoting them, I cannot approove of: many scandalles and errours I do observe in your use of them.

CHAP. I.

FIrst of all, it is an offēsive thing so abūdātly to allege such authors for our guides vnto the mysteries of religion, as do abound with innumerable dotages, prepūptuous & vaine traditiōs, lying visiōs, fayned miracles, prodigious & monstrous fables. And such are the Thalmudists & Cabalists, whō you (Mr. Ainsw.) do so often bring vpon the stage. There is almost no work or vvord of God recorded in the scriptures, vvhich they do not defile vvith their glosse. For example.

TOuching the Angels: As the Rabbines of the Sadducees vvere very grosse, saying there is a *neither Angel nor* Act. 23.8. *spirit*: so the Rabbines of the Pharisaical sect were as bold in a contrary extremity to faine any thing of them: And to give instāce first of all in your Doctour *Maimony*, he saith that the visiō of Angelles is nothing but the vision of prophecy and according to the apprehension of the beholder: that therfore b *Abraham whose vertue was great or strong saw them as men: but vnto Lot whose strength was evil they appeared as Angels.* The *Chaldee paraphrast* expounding those words, the foule of the heaven shall cary the voyce, &c. saith that c *the Angel* Raziel *shall proclaime it every day from heaven vpon the mount of Horeb*, &c. They presume to tell vs what peculiar Angels were allotted vnto severall persons to be their guides and maisters: as vnto d Adam they assigne *Raziel*; to Shem *Iophiel*: to Abraham *Zadkiel*: to Isaak *Gabriel*; to Iaakob *Peliel*: to Moses *Metatron*, &c. So for par-

a Maimony Moreh Nebuchim, Cherek. 2. pelek. 7.
c Targum on Eccles. 10. 20.
d Ioa. Reuchlin. Cabal. lib. 1.

particular actions and words recorded in the scriptures, the Rabbines tell vs how many and which angels were employed therein: In expounding psal. 137. the Chaldee paraphrast saynes *Michael* whom he calles *the Prince of Ierusalem* to make the e Targum on psal. 137. the prayer against Edom, vers. 7. & *Gabriel* whom he calles the *Prince of Sion*, to pronounce the blessing on them that should destroy Babel, vers. 8. 9. when Ester had sent *Hatach* to certify Mordecai of the Kings decree, Ester 4. 10. 12. 13. the paraphrast saith, that f Haman in his rage slew *Hatach*, and that then the f Targum on Ester. 4. Angels *Michael & Gabriel* came and supplyed the place of Hatach, delivering Esters message to Mordecai, and againe Mordecai his answer vnto Ester. And further he telles vs of King Ahasuerus his vision how he being at Esters banquet, he g *lift* g Ibid. on Chap. 7. *vp his eyes, and saw and behold 10 Angels like vnto Hamans 10 Sonnes cutting downe the trees in the royal garden, &c.* That when Haman fell downe before Ester, *the Angel Gabriel had thrust him* h Isaak Ben Arama in Akedah Isaak. Por. 44 par. 4. *downe, &c.* R. Simaih saith, when *Israel had set* we will doe, *before* we will heare, (resolving and promising to do the law before they had heard it, Exod. 19. 8 with 20. 19.) *then forth with there came 60 millions of Angels, and bound two crownes vpon every one of the Israelites, one in respect of* we wil doe, *an other in respect of* we wil heare: *but whē they sinned in the Calfe there came downe in 120 millions of destroying Angels, and broke them off, as it is said, The Children of Israel pluckt of their ornaments* (Exod. 33. 6.) Touching the Angels ascending and and descending on the ladder in the vision, *Gen.* 28, 12. they say, the i Angels of the land of i R. Solomon Iarchi in Gen. 28. 12. Israel went vp, and the outlandish Angels came downe. And so accordingly of the Angels that met Iaakob at *Mahanaim*, which signifyeth two hostes: they k say, they were one hoste of k on Gen. 32. outlandish Angels that had convoyed him to the border of Israel; and that the Angels of the land of Israel, vvere the other hoste, that came to receive him there. Other of the Rabbines l Ion Mere. in Gen. 19. 13. say that the Angels which sayd of Sodom, *We will destroy this place*, were deposed from their ministery for an 138. yeares, because they had ascribed vnto themselves that which was proper

vnto God; and were not restored vntill Iacobs time, when they ascended againe to heaven by the ladder which he saw in the vision, &c.

[m] Sebast. Munster, Annot. on Levit. 17.

TOuching wicked spirits or devilles: Some of the Rabbines [m] hold that as other creatures are compounded of 4. elements, so these of 2, to wit, of the fire and ayre: And that they have 3 properties of the ministring Angels, viz. wings; swift motion; and foreknowledge of things to come: and 3. properties of the sonnes of men, viz. to eate and drinke as men: to procreate others and multiply by generation as men: to dye & to have their bodies dissolved as men. For their meate, they say they lick the moystnes of the ayre, and are affected with perfumes and smell of the fire (according to that Rabbinical conceit noted in the Apocryphal story, where it is sayd, that the [n] perfume made with the liver and heart of a certaine fish, would drive away the divel.) Others of these Rabbines say vpon *Ge.* 2.2. That they were created imperfect in the evening of the Sabath: and that God having made their spirits, being prevented with the Sabath that came vpon him, was faine to leave his work half made: & that therefore their spirits want their bodies which otherwise should have been made for them, &c. They write o that there are 4 mothers of the divels, viz. Lilith, Naamah, Ogereth & Machalath: The [p] *Chaldee paraphrast* shewes the Prince of the spirits by name, when he saith that *Asmedai* the King of the Devilles was sent vnto Solomon to cast him out of his throne & to take his signet from him. The same [q] paraphrast also with *R. Solomon Iarchi* do tell vs of night spirits and noone spirits; that *Deber* is the name of a spirit destroying in the night and *Keteb* a spirit destroying at noone day: In so much that both the vulgar Latine and Greek translations following these Rabbines in ps. 91. do there make mention of a noonedevil. With the like presumption is *Samael* noted by [r] them to be the name of an other, that rode vpon the serpent, and deceyved Evah. That these spirits are male and female, and have difference of sexe, is often affirmed by them, so that when God com-

[n] Tobit, ch. 6. 8. 9. with 8. 3.

[o] Elias Levita in Tisbhi in jilion.

[p] Targum on Eccles. 1.12.

[q] Targ. and Rasi on Psal. 91. 6.

[r] Maimony in Moreh Nebu. chel. 2. per. 31.

[s] R Solomon Iar. in Esa. 34 14.

commanded Noah to take male and female of every living thing to keep them alive in the Ark with him, they say that [t] *the divels also* were to be receyved with the rest, as though God had given charge to preserve them from drowning: that their generations might be continued in the world. They say [u] that when wicked spirits are raysed vp, and called for by witches, or such like; that their maner is to ascend with their feet vpward and their head downeward; and that the spirit raysed by the witch of *Endor* came vp with his head first contrary to the custome in reverence & honour of King *Saul*; and that thereby the witch knew him to be King. Others go further and [x] teach mē how to defend themselves against them by charmes and circles, &c.

[t] On Gen. 6.19.

[u] R. David Kimchion 1 Sam. 28. 12.

[x] Elias Levita vbi supra.

TOuching the Spheres and starres: The Rabbines hold that [y] *they are living bodies, having an vnderstanding soule; that they have imagination, election, Will, an vnderstanding of their operations, &c.* And besides philosophical reasons alledged for proofe hereof, they do also pervert many scriptures to establish this opinion, as *ps. 19.1. The heavens declare the glory of God*: They say, *that man is far wide from the truth, that thinks this to be spoken in respect of that which appeares in them: seing that in the Hebrew tongue, that word of counting or declaring is not attributed but vnto the thing that hath vnderstanding, &c.* They say, *No man but a foole or an adversary of the truth will contradict this proofe which is taken from the words of the Prophets.* To this purpose also they alledge, *The starres of the morning praised me together, Iob. 38. 7.* Againe *Maimony* there argueth from *Gen. 1.16. Deut. 4. 19. that they must needes apprehend and know all things which they governe, &c.* Besides this, he embraceth the opinion of *Pythagoras* which *Aristotle* reiected: namely, that [z] *the heavens by their motions do make sweet and pleasant sounds, though there be many things that hinder vs from hearing those strong and sweet sounds, &c.* If the starres have such knowledge, it is the lesse wonder, that the Sun should find out and make knowne those heads of the people which sinned in *Baalpeor*: which were hanged vp vnto the

[y] Maimony in mor. Nebu. chel. 2. per. 5. & 6. & 8.

[z] Ibidem Perek 9.

Lord before the Sun, *Numb.* 25. 4. where (as *R. Solomon** records) the Sun did manifeſt & diſcover the ſinner and the guilty perſons by pearcing through the cloud and ſhining vpon them. And ſtill they hold a prognoſtication of things to come, by theſe ſtarres. As the ſun before is ſayd to have diſcovered the ſinners: ſo the moone hath like vertue aſcribed vnto her by them. It is " obſerved out of *Rambam*, *R. Menachem Rakanat*, *R. Bechai* and others, that on the ſeventh day of the ſeventh moneth at night, God ſhewes whatſoever ſhal fal out vnto them the yeare following by the ſhadow of their bodies in the moone light, as if their ſhadow want a head, or if they have no ſhadow, that then they ſhal certainely dy that yeare, &c. The ground of this magical obſervation they draw from the " words of *Ioſhua and Caleb*, vnto the people touching the *Canaanites*, ſaying *their ſhadow is departed from them*: for ſo they read the word of *ſhadow* in ſtead of *ſhield*. They ſay, that a *When the lights are eclypſed it is an evill ſigne for ever: And whereas it is ſayd, be not afrayd of the ſignes of heaven*, they interpret it thus, *When you do the will of God, ye have no need to care for the vengeance.* VVhen they apply the number of the ſpheres vnto the commandements, they ſay b *that the fift commandement*, honour thy father, &c. *hath reference vnto the ſphere of* Tſedek *or* Iupiter, *becauſe it teacheth concerning peace and righteouſnes and mercy, &c. That the ſixt commandement, Thou ſhalt not kil, hath reference vnto* Mars *becauſe it teacheth vs concerning the ſhedding of blood and woundes, &c. That the ſeventh commandement hath reference to* Venus, *that teacheth concerning the Bed, &c.* And ſo for the reſt. Vpon thoſe words of Pharaoh, *Ragnah or evill is before you*, they ſay, c that *Pharaoh* did vnderſtand by his aſtrologicall inſtrumēt, that there was a ſtar called *Ragnah* which did ariſe to meete the Iſraelites in the wildernes and that it was a ſigne of blood and ſlaughter vnto them and that therevpon when Iſrael ſinned in the Calf, & God ſought to deſtroy them, *Moſes* ſayd in his prayer, why ſhould the Egyptians ſay, he hath brought them forth vnto *Ragnah*, of which Pharaoh ſayd, *Ragnah*

*Comm&t. on Numb. 25. 4.

" Ioa. Buxt Synag. Iud. Cap. 16.

" Numb. 14. 9.

a R. Solo. in Gen. 1. 14.

b R. Abraham Aben Ezra comment. on Exo. 20.

c R. Solom. on Exo. 10. 10. & Aben Ezra on Exo. 32. 12

nah is before you: That then forthwith God repented concerning *Ragnah* (that evill ſtar) and turned the blood into the blood of Circumciſion when *Ioſhua* circumciſed them, and ſo took away the ſhame of Egypt. Againe, they write d that when God brought Abram forth, *Gen* 15. 5. it was from his Aſtrological inſtrument, by which he ſaw that *Abram* ſhould have no children; and that God ſhewed him, though *Abram* ſhould have no Children, yet *Abraham* ſhould have Children, when his name was changed, &c. They tell vs alſo in *Maaſeh thorah* in the ſtory of *Abram* that when he was but 3. yeares old, he was caſt into the furnace by *Nimrod*, for deſtroying his fathers Idols; when the Aſtrologians told *Nimrod* that the ſtar of *Abram* at his birth had devoured 4 other ſtarres, &c. Moreover they teach not onely a prediction of future things by the ſtarres, but other ſtrange operations alſo: vpon the defect of the letter *Vau* in the word *Meoroth* which ſignifyeth the *lights* which God created the fourth day, they f tell how dangerous a day that is, in reſpect of the ſquinancy wherevnto the Children are then moſt ſubiect: and of the faſt ordayned that day of the week to prevent that evill. They g write that the Sun to celebrate the day of his nativitie, doth evermore throughout the whole yeare even in time of greateſt tempeſts, yet alwayes ſhine vpon the fourth day of the week on which it was created. Of the Sonnes of God mentioned *Gen.* 6. 2 they h ſay that they were wiſe men exerciſed in aſtrologie, which took vnto themſelves wives which were borne vnder the ſame diſpoſition of the heavens that they themſelves were, and that ſo being of the ſame conſtellation they brought forth mighty men, &c. Others of them do not onely record that the ſtarres teach, but alſo ſtirre vs vp vnto ſeverall actions and vertues, as that *Tſedek* or Iupiter *megnorer el hatſedek* ſtirreth vp vnto righteouſnes and the feare of the Lord; That *Nogah* or Venus ſtirreth vp love, &c.

d R. Solon Gen. 15. 5.

e Seb. Munſt. Arnot. on Gen. 12. 1.

f Raſi or R. Solom Iarchi on Gen. 1. 14.

g Joan. Hack Levita prefat. ad Kuach hachen. & Aben Ezra on Gen. 6. 2.

h Ben Arama, in Akedath Iſaak, Porá. 45.

TOuching the Cloudes and other meteores in the loweſt heavens: *R. Samuel bar Iſaak* ſaith, k *Behold, the Cloudes of the mor-*

k Talmud in Beracoth cap. 9 Fol. 59. A

morning there is no ioy in them, as it is written, your goodnes is as a morning Cloud, Hos. 6 And the like prognostications they do obserue in the same place touching the lightnings and other Cloudes. Touching the *Rainebow* though God appoynted it to be the signe of his covenant vnto perpetual generations, yet l because of the defect of *Vau* in the word *Doroth* which signifieth *generations*, they obserue and teach that there were some generations of just and perfect men wherein they needed not this signe of the Rainebow: as namely in the generation of *Hezekiah* King of Iudah, and in the generation of *R. Shimeon ben Iochai*. From the winde that blowes vpon a certaine day they prognosticate what weather they shal have for the whole yeare following: *R. Isaak bar Abidemi* * saith, that vpon the latter good day of the feast, every man lookes after the smoke of the campe: If the smoak incline to the North, then the poore are glad, and the rich housholders are sad: viz. because the South winde blowing at that time, and driving the smoak into the North is a signe of great raine that yeare, which shal rot the fruits, and so force the rich to bring them forth and sell them for small price vnto the poore: If the smoak incline to the South then the rich are glad, and the poore are sad, that Northwind driving the smoak Southward being a signe of such a dry season, that the rich may store vp their fruits and not bring them forth to the poore: If the smoak encline to the vvest then all are sad: because the hurtfull East wind driving the smoak into the vvest is a signe of dearth and famine: If the smoak incline to the East, thē all are glad, because the vvest winde driving the smoak into the East is a signe of such a temperate season as shall bring abundance for benefit both of rich and poore. So they m say of the North winde that it did not blow for the space of 40. yeares together whiles Israel was in the wildernes, least it should have blowne away the cloude of glory from the Tabernacle: the nature of the North winde being to scatter the cloudes (Iob. 37. 22.) And that for this cause also they did not circumcise their Children for 40 yeares, because they wanted the North winde whose

l Rasi on Gen. 9 12.

* Thalmud in Ioma, C. 1. Fol. 21.

m R. David Kimchion Iosh. 5. 2.

whose propertie is to heale; and that therfore the sore made by cutting the flesh in circumcision would have bene dangerous to the Children. They presume also to tell vs what particular Angels are set over several windes of which afterward.

TOuching man: *R. Ieremiah ben Eleazar* saith that n *God created the first man* do partsuphin, *With two faces or persons, as it is sayd Ps. 139. 5, thou hast fashioned me behind and before.* This they also collect from that which Moses saith, that God created them *male & female*: Hence they gather that the first man was created with a double person at the first, that he was both man and woman, both male and female, an Hermaphrodite: and that these 2. persons were parted asunder then when God tooke the rib out of the side of Adam, &c. As for the soules of men, they hold that they were created before the bodies: that all the Prophets were in their soules present at the delivery of the law on mount Sinai, many generations before they were borne, & that their prophecies were there delivered vnto them. Some of them teach that God created man with original sin: *R. Nachman bar Chisda* o asking the question why *vajitser* in Gen. 2. 7, is written with two *iods*, makes this answer, that the holy blessed God created man with two inclinations or dispositions, with *itser tob, & itser ragh*, with a good disposition & an evill disposition. And in the same place it is sayd of the two reynes that the one at the right side counselleth vnto good, and the other at the left side counselleth vnto evill, &c. VVhen a man dyes and is buried, they write that the p Angel of death comes and sits vpon the sepulchre & then the soule entring into the body againe, causeth the man to stand vpon his feet: Then the Angel of earth with a chayne in his hand half of yron, and half of fire striketh the man, so that at the first stroke his members are dissolved: at the second his bones are scattred, which the Angels come and gather: at the third he is turned to dust and ashes and so the body returnes into the sepulcher, &c. As for the soule, as the same Elias shewes, they say it is three times created: This they vnderstand of the revo

lution

n Talmud in Beracoth cap. 9 Fol. 61. Rasi on Gen. 1 27.

Rasi on Hagh. 1 6 & on Mal. 1. 1.

o Talmud in Beracoth, c. 9. Fol. 61.

p Elias Levita in Tishbi in Chibbut hakkeber.

q Tishbi in Gigal,

lution of soules through the bodies of three men: And for proof hereof they alledg that saying in Iob, [t] *All these things will God work thrise with a man.* Hence also they say the soule of the first man was translated into the body of David, & from thence is to returne into the body of Messias: This the Cabalists note by the three letters of Adams name, A, D, M, whereof the first stands for *Adam*, the second for *David*, the third for *Messias*. But they teach that the soules of great sinners do passe into the bodies of beasts: as the soule of a Sodomite into the body of a hare: and the soule of an adulterer into the body of a Camel: and that therfore *David* in the [u] psalme praiseth God, with these word, *ki gamal li*, which they interpret thus, *because he hath delivered my soule from the Camel*: he for his adultery having deserved to be translated into the body of an vncleane Camel, &c.

[t] Iob. 33. 29.

[u] Psal. 13. 5

TOuching the stories of particular men: Of *Adam* they [x] say that for those hundred and thirtie yeares vntill *Sheth*, he lived separate from his wife, viz. after his banishment out of Eden. Of *Cain*, & the mark set vpon him; *R Solomon* [y] saith it was a letter of Gods name imprinted in the forehead of Cain: *R. Iehudah* saith it was the sphere of the Sun which was made to rise vpon him: *R. Nehemiah* [z] saith it was the leprosy arising on him: *R. Aba* saith it was a dog given vnto him: viz. to go before him and defend him from wilde beasts or those that would kill him: *R. A. Ioseph* saith it was a horne that grew out of him, &c. Of *Lamech*, they [a] write that he being blinde slew *Cain*: that being led by his sonne *Tubal cain*, to whō *Cain* appeared as a wilde beast, he spoke vnto his father to shoote, vvho shot and killed *Kain*: that vvhen he knew vvhat he had done, to wit, that it vvas *Kain* his ancestour whom he had slaine, then he smote one hand vpon anjother, and clapt his sonne *Tubal-kain* betwixt them and so slevv him also: That herevpon vvhen his vvives separated from him, he excused himself by his errour: that if *Kain* vvho slevv his brother presumptuously had his punishment deserd for seven generations,

[x] Rasi in Gen. 5. 3.

[y] On Gen. 4. 15.

[z] Akedath Isaak, Portâ xx.

[a] R. Sol. on Gen. 4. 23.

tions, then he offending through errour and mistaking should be forborne for many more sevens, &c. Of *Noah* they [b] write that vntill his time they had no instruments of plowing: that he prepared them: that the earth brought forth thornes and thistles when they sowed wheat, for the curse of the first man: that in the dayes of *Noah*, this curse ceassed: that this is it which is vvritten of him, *he shall comfort vs*, &c. VVhereas there is mention, of his drunkennes and nakednes in the middes of his tent: because *Aholoh* signifying *his tent* is there written with the letter *he*, they [c] collect thence that by way of a mysterie thereby is noted hovv the 10. tribes vvhich are called *Aholah* (Ezek. 23.) should go into captivitie for drinking vvine in bowles. And whereas it is sayd, that *Cham saw the nakednes of his father*: some of the Rabbines expound it, that *Cham* gelded *Noah*, and that he sayd vnto his brethren: *The first man had but two sonnes and one slew the other for the possession of the world, but our father hath three sonnes and yet he seekes to have a fourth.* Therefore they say that *Canaan* the fourth sonne of *Cham* was cursed, because he would not that his father *Noah* should beget a fourth sonne, &c. And that *Shem* & *Iapheth* for covering their father obteyned this blessing, viz. that the posteritie of *Shem* should weare *zizith* or fringes on their garments: that the posterity of *Iapheth* should obteyne a buriall, as it is said, *I will give vnto* Gog *a place* there for burial, &c. (Ezek. 39. 11.) Of *Abram & Noah* they [d] observe, because it is sayd of *Noah* that he walked *with God* (Gen. 6. 9) and to *Abram*, walk *before me* (Gen 17. 1.) that therfore *Noah* was inferiour to Abram: like to little Children whereof the less is led by the hand and goes *with* the father, and the other that is stronger is appoynted to go *before* him, &c. VVhen they tell hovv *Terach* brought *Abram* his sonne before *Nimrod* for breaking his Idolles, and hovv he vvas cast into the fiery furnace, they record further concerning *Haran* his brother, that he thought vvithin himself, if *Abram* overcome I vvill be like vnto him: if [e] *Nimrod* overcome I vvill be like vnto him: And vvhen Abraham vvas delivered, *Haran* being

[b] R. Solom on Gen. 5. 29.

[c] Idem on Gen. 9. 21. 22. 23, &c.

[d] R Isaak Ben Arama in kedath Isaak, Portâ 12.

[e] R. Solomō on Gen. 11 28.

being demanded to vvhom he vvould be like, he anſwered to *Abram*: vvherevpon they caſt him into the fiery furnace, wherein he vvas burned. This they vvill have to be noted when it
[z] Gen. 11. 28 is ſayd, [z] *Then Haran dyed before the face of Terah his Father, in vr of the Chaldees*: becauſe *vr* ſignifieth fire. VVhere it is ſayd that *Abram* brought forth *three hundred & eighteene* perſons to purſue the Kings: the [g] Rabbines vvill have this to be vnderſtood of *Eliezer* alone, who was Abrams ſteward: that he alone went with Abram to the battel, becauſe according to their *Gematria*, the [h] numerall letters of *Eliezer* his name in the Hebrevv do ſtand for *three hundred and eighteene*. Of *Og* the giant, they [*] write that it vvas he vvhich eſcaped from the ſlaughter of the Sodomites made by *Amraphel* & his companions: that he came & told *Abram* of the battel, thinking that *Abram* alſo vvould be ſlaine, and that he then would get *Sarai* to be his wife: And that this *Og* alſo eſcaped from the flood being one of thoſe *Nephilims*, the giants that lived before the flood. Indeed if this *Og* vvas of ſuch a ſtature as the *Thalmudiſts* do [“] write, viz. that *Moſes* being 10 cubites high, & having an axe in his hand 10 cubites long, and leaping alſo 10 cubites frc m the ground could yet reach but vnto the ankles of *Og*, vvhen he killed him: then might this giant have reſted vpon ſome mountaine, over which the vvaters prevayled 15. cubites: And ſo as 8. perſons vvere ſaved in the ark, he ſhould be the ninth, that eſcaped drovvning being out of the ark. They [i] ſay of *Naamah* that ſhe vvas the wife of *Noah*: of [k] *Hagar* that ſhe vvas the daughter of *Pharaoh*, who when he ſaw the vvonders done for *Sarah*, ſayd it is better that my daughter be a ſervant in this houſe, then a Queene in another houſe. Of [l] *Lots* vvife, that ſhe vvas turned into a pillar of ſalt becauſe ſhe refuſed to give a litle ſalt vnto the travellers or ſtrangers that came into her houſe. Of *Thamar* defiled by *Iuaah*, they [m] ſay that ſhe was the daughter of *Melchizedek* or *Shem*, and vvas therfore to be burned becauſe being the Prieſts daughter ſhe playd the harlot. Of *Rebekah* they tell great vvonders: hovv [n] vvhen ſhe came to draw vvater, the vvater of it

g R. Sol. on Gen. 14. 14.

h

ה	1
ש	300
י	10
ע	70
ר	7
ק	200
	318

* R Solom. on Gen. 14. 13.

“ Thalmud in Beracoth c. 9. fo. 54.

i R. Sol. on Gen. 4. 22.

k Idem on Gen. 16. 1.

l Idem on Gen. 19. 26

m On Gen. 38. 24.

n On Gen. 24. 17.

of it ſelf came vp out of the well to meet her: how the [o] earth clept and remooved vnder *Abrahams* ſervant to bring him in one day to his iourneys end, vnto *Meſopotamia*: how an [p] angel came & killed *Bethuel* for ſeeking to delay the journey of *Rebekah* vnto Iſaak. Of *Leah* they [q] ſay that her eyes were become tender with weeping for feare that ſhe ſhould have bene given for a wife vnto *Eſaw* the elder brother, as *Rachel* her yonger ſiſter was given to *Iaakob* the yonger brother. Of *Dinah* they [r] ſay that ſhe being firſt conceyved a male in the vvombe of *Leah*, was by her prayer turned into a female, leaſt her ſiſter *Rachel* ſhould be inferiour to the handmaydes in Children, &c. And further they ſay of *Dinah*, not being reckoned with his eleven Children, when *Iaakob* was to meet *Eſaw*, that [s] ſhe was put into a cheſt and lockt vp, leaſt *Eſaw* ſhould ſet his eyes vpon her: and that therfore *Iaakob* was puniſhed, becauſe ſhe being given to *Eſaw* might have bene a meanes to have converted him to goodnes: that therfore ſhe fell into the hand of *Schechem*. The like thing do they record of *Sarah* alſo, viz. that *Abram* going downe into Egypt becauſe of the famine, [t] did ſhut vp *Sarah* into a cheſt, and that ſhe was found by the receyvers of the tribute, who opened the cheſt and ſaw her. Of *Levi* they [u] ſay, that when he was borne, God ſent the Angel *Gabriel* to bring the Child before him: and that ſo he gave him this name: and gave him the foure & twenty gifts of the Prieſthood: that in this reſpect he was called *Levi*. Of *Ioſhua* his buriall in *Timnath-ſerah*, or *Timnath-heres*, *Iudg.* 2. 9. they [x] ſay, that the place was ſo called, becauſe of *temunath Heres* or the image of the Sun that was ſet vpon his ſepulchre, with this ſaying, *This is he that made the Sun to ſtand ſtill, &c.* And that the mountaine vvas called *Gaaſh* which ſignifyeth ſhaking and mooving: becauſe when the Iſraelites at the burial of *Ioſhua* did not mourne and lament for him as was meet, the earth did then quake and the mountaine was mooved againſt them. VVhen *Ioſhua* ſayd o ſun, (*dom*) ſtay thou in Gibeon, &c. they [y] ſay that by vertue of a ſong called *Dom, Dom*, he ſtayed the

o Ibid. ob verſ. 42.

p Ibid. ob verſ. 55.

q On Gen. 29. 17.

r On Gen. 30. 21.

s On Gen. 32. 22.

t On Gen. 12. 14.

u On Gen. 29. 34.

x R. David Kimchi, & R Sol. on Ioſh. 24. 30

y R. Sol on Ioſh. 10 12

Sun: and that all the while ſo long as he did ſing *Dom*, it ſtood ſtil. and went not forward. Of the two ſpies ſent by *Ioſhua*, they [z] ſay that they were *Caleb* and *Phinehas*: and that *Phinehas* being an Angel he ſtood before the people and they neither knew him nor ſaw him: and that therfore it is ſayd of *Caleb* onely, that *Rahab* the harlot did hide him, &c. Of *Sampſon* they [a] vvrite, that when he deſired to be avenged of the Philiſtines for his eyes, that he prayed for the vengeance vpon them but onely in reſpect of one of his eyes, & that he deſired of God that the reward for his other ey & the loſſe of it might be reſerved vnto him in the world to come. Of *Iphtah* though ſome [b] write that he was buryed in divers cities for his honour; that having neither ſonne nor daughter his bones were buryed part of them in one citie & part of them in an other, for a memorial] how he had delivered them from the Ammonites: yet others [c] ſay the contrary, that he was ſtriken with a greevous boyle: that the members of his body fell of, ſome in one city & ſome in an other: that ſo they were buryed in divers cities: & this for a puniſhment vnto him becauſe he ſlew his daughter, and did not further enquire concerning his vow: Of *Samuel* they [d] write that he was rayſed vp by the witch of *Endor*: & that *Samuel* thereby vvas much diſquieted and ſore afrayd thinking that it had bene the day of judgement, and that he had bene called to judgement: and that therfore he brought *Moſes* with him for his help and ſafe conduct, &c. Of *Paltiel* they [e] write that he was ſo called becauſe God delivered him from ſinning againſt *Mical* the wife of David, and that he had layd a ſword betwixt him & her in the bed for a token thereof, &c. Of *Obededom* they [f] write that the bleſsing of his houſe conſiſted in this that his wife & his eight daughters in law brough forth ech of them ſix ſonnes at once, and that hence are thoſe 62. mentioned *1. Chro. 26.* 8. Of *Naboth*, they [g] write that the ſpirit which came forth to be a lying ſpirit in the mouth of *Ahabs* Prophets, was the ſpirit of *Naboth*, &c. Of *Elias* & *Eliſha* they [h] write that *Eliſha* powring water on the handes of

[z] R. David Kimchi on Ioſh. 2. 4.

[a] Idem on Iud. 16. 28

[b] Ralbag or R. Levi ben. Gerſõ on Iudg. 12 7.

[c] R. David Kimchi ibid.

[d] R. Solom. on 1. Sam. 28. 13. 15. & Kimchi ibidem.

[e] R. David Kim. on 2. Sam. 3. 15. & R. Sol. ibid.

[f] R. Solom. on 2. Sam. 6. 11.

[g] Kimchi & Raſi on 1. Kin. 22. 20. 21.

[h] R. Sol. on 1. Kin. 18. 34. & on 2. Kin. 3. 11.

of Elias, his fingers did miraculouſly become like 10 fountaines of vvater to fill the ditch made about the altar in mount *Carmel*, &c. Of *Ahaz* they [i] feigne this miracle that when he dyed the day was ſhortned 10. degrees, and that the Sunne went downe ten houres before the time, to the end that the mourning of the people for him might quickly be at an end, becauſe he was wicked: and that in recompence hereof, in the dayes of *Hezekias* the Sun came back and returned thoſe 10. degrees which it haſted to go downe in *Ahaz* his time. And with ſuch fictions and additions vnto the holy ſtory, they abound in every place.

[i] R. David Kimchi & R. Solo. on 2. Kin. 20. 11.

TOuching the ſenſitive creatures, as birds, beaſtes and fiſhes they preſume in like maner: Of the *Raven* that Noah ſent out of the arke, they [k] ſay that he flew about the arke & went not as he was ſent for the jelouſy that he had of his make or fellow againſt Noah: and that this ſame *Raven* alſo was reſerved vnto *Elias* his time to bring him bread and fleſh morning and evening. And ſome of the Rabbines preſume and [l] ſay that this bread and fleſh vvas brought by the Ravens from the table of *Ahab*: others ſay it was brought frõ the table of *Iehoſhaphat*. Of a certaine Bird, which they call *Bar-juchne*, it is written in the [m] *Thalmud*, that when this fearfull bird, caſt but one egge out of her neſt, it drowned 60 townes, and broke downe 300. Cedar trees. And as *Elias Levita* [n] records, with this bird alſo is the banquet for the righteous prepared, togather with the Leviathan, and the wilde Oxe. Againe *Rabba bar Channah* ſaith he [o] ſaw on a certaine time a frog as big as *Akra* a towne in Hagronia conteyning 60. houſes: that a ſerpent or Dragon came and devoured that frog: that ſtraightway a great Raven or *Poſhkantſa* came and devoured both the Frog & the Dragon, and flying away light vpon a tree, &c. Theſe and a huge number more of ſuch fables are recorded by your ancient Rabbines & Hebrew doctours, by ſo much worſe then Aeſops tables: in that theſe are * told for truth, but his not ſo: theſe are confirmed with pretence of holy ſcripture, to the great abuſe of the

[k] R. Sol. on Gen. 8. 7.

[l] R. David Kimchi on 1 Kin. 17. 4

[m] Tract. Becoroth Cap. 9. f. 57.

[n] Tiſhbi in vocabulo Iuchna.

[o] Thalmud in Babha bathra Cap. 5. Fol. 73.

* R. Otto in Gali razia lib. 3. c. 11.

name of God: but so are not his: these are set downe without any good vse of them, but his fables had their moralles annexed for vse and instruction of men. VVhat good morall vse can we make of this Parable of the great frog, vnlesse happily it may serve to represent vnto vs the estate of your separation? you yourself // compare *Mr. Smith* vnto *Behemoth* in bignes; & some reason there was, for by the profession of separation which he then made he devoured all the Churches of Christe, and so was comparable in greatnes to this Rabbines frog: but presently *Mr. Iohnson* like the great Dragon comes and devoures Mr. Smith: and straightway come you like the great Raven of the separation and devoure both the frog & the Dragon, both *Mr. Smith* & *Mr. Iohnson* so that you *Mr. Ainsworth*, remaine the huge *Poshkantsa* that devoure and swallow vp all: All the churches of God, all Christians, yea all the separate companies beside are in your belly: according to your doctrine no religious communion may be reteyned with any of them. And therefore as the Lord once theatned the devouring citie; * *vvo vnto the craw*; as the word in the Hebrew signifies: so may it still be sayd, vvoe vnto this craw of the separation that devoures all Christian communion.

// Defenc. against Mr. Smith. Pag. 106.

* Zephan. 3. 1.

Touching *Behemoth*; both the a *Chaldee paraphrast* & other of the Rabbines expounding those words of the Psalme: *The beasts on a thousand mountaines*, interpret them of one beast, of *Behemoth*, that great creature which is mentioned *Iob.* 40. 10 This Behemoth is sayd in one day to eat vp and devoure the grasse of those thousand mountaines, which they wil also have to spring againe and to be renewed every day. And this beast as they say is reserved for the banquet of the righteous in the garden of Eden in the world to come, viz. vvhen their messias shal come. They b tell vs also of a strange *Oxe* with one horne in his forehead, which the first man should offer for a sacrifice the first day that he was created: They c say that this is that yong Bullock mentioned in *psal.* 69. 31. from whence they also do collect that this *Oxe* had the horne created before the hooses,

a Targum on psal. 50. 10. & Rasi ibid. &c.

b Talmud in cholin. c. 3. fol. 60

c Targum on ps. 69. 31 & Rasi, ibid.

hooses, becaus the order in the words in the psalme is thus, *which hath hornes & hooses*, the horne being first mentioned. Of the *Ramme* which Abraham offred in stead of his sonne Isaak, they d say it was created in the beginning of the world, and prepared herevnto from the sixt day of the creation: This *Ramme* they hold to be one of those 10. things created in the evening of the first Sabath. And they note further, that when this *Ramme* came running vnto *Abraham*; Satan seing the same thrust the Ramme into the bush, &c. Of a *Roe* in the forest of *Elai*, they e write that in the time of sleep one eye is still ope, when the other is shut: And the g *Chaldee paraphrast* noting this same thing, will have this to be that *Roe* wherevnto the Messias is compared. The Thalmud // records, that on a certaine time when the Romane Emperour enquired of *Rabbi Iehoshua* the sonne of *Hananias*, why their God compared himself vnto a Lyon: and whether he was so strong that he could kill a Lyon. The Rabbine answers, that their God did not compare himself vnto a common Lyon but vnto the Lyon that was in the forrest of *Elai*. Herevpon the Emperour desires that this Lyon may be shewed vnto him: and the Rabbine making supplication vnto God, the sayd Lyon comes running out of the forrest, and being 400. miles from the Emperour, he roared so strongly, that the women with Childe in Rome fell in travel before their time, and the walles of the citie fell downe. VVhen as he had come an 100. miles neerer, then he roared againe so terribly, that all the Romanes teeth fell out of their heads, and the Emperour himself half dead fell downe from his throne vnto the ground: intreating the Rabbine that this Lyon might returne vnto the forest, from whence he came: which also was done according to his desire. By the view of these fables, the reader may learne in some part, what to judge and how to esteeme of your Thalmudicall allegations. VVhat goodnes or fruit is there in these fables? vvill you have your separation represented by this Lyon in the forest of Ela? If it were true that you professe and pretend, the terrour of your roaring should

d Rasi on Gen. 22. 13.

e Thorah Or, 1. Glos in Thalmud, chok. c. 3. fol. 59

g Thargum on Cant. 8. 14.

// Tractat. Cholin, c. 3. f. 59.

ſhould not onely make the walles of Rome to fall downe, but the walles of all reformed Churches: both their materiall buildings & temples as you plead in this writing, and alſo all their ſpirituall ſociety and communion ſhould be diſſolved: but as the Lyon of *Elai* when he drew neere to Rome, was yet turned back by the Rabbines: ſo when you drew neere to Rome, through the title of your book that roared in the Franckford catalogue as I noted "before, yet have you alſo bene perſwaded to ſtay that roaring a while, and to ſpare them that were ready to periſh at the ſound thereof.

"Pag.

Of the *Leviathan*, *R. Iehuda* * ſaith, whatſoever God hath created, he hath created male and female, and ſo without doubt the *Leviathan*: And leaſt they being ſo great ſhould deſtroy the world if they did multiply, therfore God hath gelded the male & killed the female & powdred her with ſalt for the righteous in the world to come. For proofe of this he alledgeth *Pſa. 27. 1.* And in the ſame place, *R. Ionathan* ſaith, that when the angel *Gabriel* ſhall hunt this *Leviathan*, he could not prevaile except God did help him. This hunting they collect from that place in *Iob. 40. 20. Wilt thou draw out Leviathan with a hooke?* Of the *Whale* that ſwallowed *Ionas*, they "ſay that the two eyes of the fiſh were in ſtead of two vvindooes vnto the prophet, through which he ſaw all that was in the Sea: that God ſhewed him the red Sea, & how Iſrael paſſed through the middes thereof, &c. Becauſe it is ſayd, that *Suph* or *the weedes were wrapt about his head*, they do vainely collect from thence that *jam ſuph* or the *red Sea* was before him: there being the continent betwixt the red Sea and that Sea whereinto *Ionas* was caſt. And here they write further, that the great whale which firſt ſwallowed *Ionas*, was a male, where *Ionas* had ſuch a large roome in his belly, that he did not give his minde vnto prayer: wherevpon God ſpoke vnto this VVhale to caſt him out of his belly into the mouth of the female who being full of yong ones, *Ionas* had not there ſuch roome, and ſo being in a ſtrait, that then he prayed, as it is ſayd, out of the bowelles of the Fiſh. *Ion. 1. 17.*

*Thalmud in Babha Bathra, c. 5 f. 74. & 75.

"R. Solom. on Ion. 2. 5

"R. Solom. on Ion. 1. 17.

Tou-

TOuching the vegetative creatures as plants, trees, &c. They ſay of them in generall, that though they were created the third day, yet they did not then appeare, but the earth brought them forth onely to the dore of the earth, vvhere men treat, vntill the ſixt day: that then at the prayer of Adam there came ſhewers of raine, that then they budded forth and were ſeene. Of the trees in the orchyards of *Eliphaz, Bildad & Zophar*, there is this miracle recorded by the "*Chaldee paraphraſt*", that when the ſe three freinds of Iob ſaw the trees in their orchards withered away: that the bread for their food was turned into living fleſh: that the vvine of their feaſts vvas turned into blood, then they came every man from his place to viſit Iob: and that for this meritorious vvork they vvere delivered from the place appoynted vnto them in hell. Of the tree of life, they have this paradox, that * it vvas a journey of fifty yeares: & that this meaſure was the height of it, beſides the head of it, & the breadth of the branches. Of the cedars growing in the garden of *Eden*, the *Chaldee paraphraſt* vvrites "how they ſhalbe brought from thence for the building of a new temple at the coming of Meſſias. Of the tree planted by the rivers of vvaters, vvherevnto the godly man is compared in *Pſal. 1. 3.* they "ſay, that it vvas a tree, vvhich God planted in the arke vpon the face of the vvaters. An[d] hundreds of ſuch like vanities do fill their vvritings every vvhere.

"Thalmud Maſechet Succa, Cap. 3 fol. 52. & Maſechet Beſchiſchim Gen. 2. 5

"Targum on Iob. 2. 11.

*Mirmaſ in Midraſch Neelchet Parſ. 31

"Targum Onkelos Gen. 3.

Beth Aſcurei in Midraſch Pirke Eliez. Cap. 18. Port. 12.

BVt you ſay that, *for "Ieviſh forbidden fables of which there are too many you paſſe them over as unprofitable*. Antw. 1. The vvriters of notorious fables and lyes do therfore looſe their credit in other aſſertions, and deſerve to have their vvritings vvholly paſſed over as being guided therein by the a father of lyes, and ſo being the inſtruments of Satan to lead men into errour are to be had in ſuſpicion in all that they ſay, vnleſſe there be ſufficient proofe of the ſame by ſome other meanes. 2. How true it is that you paſſe over their fabulous vvritings in expounding the ſcriptures let the reader conſider by theſe fevv inſtances that follow: you record hovv the Hebrevv Do-

"Preface to Annotations on Geneſis.

a Ioh. 8. 44

Annot. on Gen. 4. 22.

ctours say of *Naamah*, that all the world wandred (in love) after her, yea even the sonnes of God, (as in Gen. 6. 2.) and that of her there were borne evill spirits into the world. You "relate from the fabulous *Thargum Ierusalemy* that the three Angelles sent vnto *Abraham* were sent for three things, because it cannot be, that moe things then one should be sent by the hand of one of the high angelles: that the first Angell was sent to shew glad tidings to *Abraham*, &c. The second to deliver *Lot*: the third to overthrow *Sodom*, &c. This fable is not onely repugnant to the scriptures but to other of the *Rabbines* also relating it after an other maner: *R. Solomon Iarchi* /· saith, that one of these three Angelles was sent to bring the good tidings to Sarah one to overthrow Sodom and one to heale Abraham (meaning for his sore after circumcision) &c. & that he which healed Abraham was *Raphael*. Other of them tell this tale yet an other way. Some thing like vnto this *vnproffitable Iewish fable*, is that which you ll record frō *Maimony* touching the enquiry by *vrim*: that they made not inquirie of two things at once: & if they so enquired, yet the answer was but vnto the first onely. You "record from *R. Menachem*, touching the 70. persons that went downe into Egipt, that things beneath do mystically signify things above: and that these 70. soules signifyed the 70. Angelles that are about Gods glorious throne, the presidents over the (seventie) nations. VVhy might you not as well send vs to the fables of *S. Denys* touching the divers orders and offices of Angelles for the expositon and illustration of the scriptures as vnto these dotards? In your exposition of Moses his sight of the back parts of the Lord, you /· record this Iewish tradition from *Maimony & R. Menachem*, that God then appeared like *sheliach tsibbur*, clad with a robe like a minister of the congregation. You // report from the *Thargum* that the first tables of the law were hewen out of the saphir of the throne of Gods glorie mentioned in *Exo. 24. 10.* These Iewish traditions are presumptuous a forbidden additions to the holy storie more vnlawfull then many of their grossest fables, like vnto

" Annot. on Gen. 18. 2.

/· Comon Gen. 18 2, &c.

// Annot. on Exo. 28 34

" Annot. on Gen. 46 27.

/· Annot. on Exo. 33 23.

// On Exo. 32. 16.

a Col. 2. 18
1 Cor. 4. 6
Deut. 4. 2. & 12. 32. & 29. 29.

those forged mirackles which the popish legends do adde vnto the story of the new testament touching the acts of the Apostles and other saints. Though Moses was b faithfull in all the house of God, yet as if his story had bene defective, and his writings imperfect, you help to make it vp with the superstitious traditions of the Rabbines. You /· tell vs from their canons, that whersoever *fine linnen twisted*, is spoken of in the law, it must be *six double thred*: That wheresoever this word *twisted* is vsed alone (as it is in *Exo. 39 24*) it must be *eight double thred*: That the robe was all of blew, and the threds thereof were "*twelve times double*: That the breast plate & Ephod were /· *woven with 28 threds*, &c. Moses c telleth vs that Abraham would not have so much as a threed from the King of Sodom, to avoyd offence, least he should say he had made Abraham rich: and by his example you also had done better if in the exposition of the law you had not taken the description of one threed from the infidel Moses Bar Meimon, otherwise the the faithull Moses hath described the same: The Rabbines may say they have made you rich: that your Annotations are enriched with their traditions: so are you an offense to the Iewes. Againe to give light vnto the scriptures you // send vs vnto the Thalmud, and alledge from thence the superstitious order in trimming and lighting the lamps of the golden candlestick: The Children of light need not to learne such things from the Prince of darknes. Though Moses in his story was guided by the spirit of him that is the d *wonderfull Numbrer*, yet as if the numbers and measures of the sanctuary had bene insufficiently described by him, you for our further instruction will needes *record vnto vs a more full reckoning frō the Thalmudiques: as for example, that *they say* touching the shew bread, that the lēgth of every cake was 10. hādbredths, & the breadth, 5. handbreaths, and the height 7. fingers. That the "belles on Aarons robe were in number 72, that they hanged 36 on the one skirt, and 36 on the other: that in these 72 belles were 72, clappers, all of gold, &c. That the plate of the holy crowne

b Numb. 12 7. Heb. 3. 2.

/· Annot. Exo. 26. 1, " On Exo. 28. 33.

" Ibid on vers. 32.

/· On Exo. 28. 6.

c Gen. 14 21. 24.

// Annot. on Exod. 27. 21.

d Dan 8. 13.

* Annot. on Exo. 25 30.

" On Exo. 28 33

was "a long plate of gold, two fingers broad and reached from one ear to an other: That the ‡ girdle was about 3. fingers broad and 32. cubites long, &c. These and many more such like novelties have you recorded from the presumptuous Rabbines, who being rashly puft vp of their fleshly mindes have added these things vnto the word of God. Though the spirit of God hath thought it meet to passe over these things, and to mention none of them in his word, yet you on the contrary have thought it meet not to passe them over, but to joyne them vvith your notes for illustration of the scripture.

"Ibid. on vers. 36. ‡ Ibid. on vers. 39.

But touching the Iewish forbidden fables, you say further; ‖ *some things also you note from them, not as approving them your self absolutely, but leaving them to further consideration of the prudent.* Ans. 1. If you did absolutely approve thē, you should be more absurd then I can yet imagine that you are. It is too much that you approve them in so great a measure, as to alledge such a multitude of them without any note of dislike or censure vpon the allegation of them: even in such maner as good writers do vse ordinarily to alledge the testimonies of those whom they do approve. 2. For more particular approbation, let the reader consider how you approve that false and frivolous saying of *R. Menachem*, namely, that * *Abraham cleaved vnto the condition of mercie, for that is the south of the world: and therfore all Abrahams iourneyes were towards the South*: to confirme this you do vainely alledge the scriptures *Ezek.* 40. 2. *Ier.* 1. 13. 14. For many of Abrahams journeys were not toward the south; And the scriptures do often shew mercy and judgements by & from the North and South indifferently. VVhen you "alledge the false assertion of *Maimony* concerning Prophets: that they saw no prophetical vision, but by dream or by night vision, (*Numb.* 12. 6. & 22. 19, 20) or by day, after that a dead sleep was fallen vpon them: (*Dan.* 10 9.) And all that Prophesied, their joynts trembled, there remayned no strength in them, &c. you adde then for confirmation, *But they except Moses, as the scripture also doth, Nūb.* 12. 7, 8. But how doth the scripture make an exceptiō from

‖ Preface so annot.

* Annot. on Gen. 12 9.

* Annot. on Gen. 15 12.

from that which it never affirmed? Though Moses be exalted above other prophets in the place alledged: yet neither doth the scripture determine visions to be either night visions, or in the day after a dead sleep: neither doth it affirme that trembling of all that prophesied: neither is Moses excepted from that trembling. And *Maimony* himself when he els where "describes *eleven degrees of prophesie* doth therein refute his owne distinction, whiles there in the tenth and eleventh degree he gives instances of the visions of *Ioshua* by Iericho and of *Abraham* in the mount Morijah, which yet were neither by dream, nor by night vision, nor by day after a dead sleep. 3. Though you thus approve their vaine expositions, yet do you at other times refuse their more sound interpretations: as when ‡ *R. Abraham aben Ezra, R. David Kimchi, and R. Sol. Iarchi* do expound the action of Iaakob holding Esaw by the heele (which is expressed in the name *Iaakob*,) to be a signe and note of his power, dignity and victory over Esaw, yet you write that ‖ *Iaakob is a name that noteth infirmitie, &c.* and do observe that * *the Church, when speech is of her infirmitie, is often called Iaakob: & when her glorie and valour throughout the scriptures may be observed:* as though we might not as well and truely observe, that the Church, when speech is of her infirmitie, is often called *Israel*, yea when the miserable apostate Church for defection is cast of and divorced from the Lord, the scripture still gives the name of *Israel* vnto her, rather then the name of *Iaakob*: and on the other side, when her glory, valour and dignity is signified, she is also called *Iaakob*. 4. VVhereas you say of those vaine traditions, which you do not absolutely approve, that you *leave them to further consideration of the prudent*. I aske you what the imprudent and simple shall do, of whom there is the greatest number, and into whose hāds especially these your annotations are like to come; belike it is enough that they stand amazed admiring these rare Rabbinical conceits, though they know not what to say or think of them. How do you forget the rule of the Apostle, which requireth

"Morch Nebuchim Chel. 2. per. 45.

‡ Comment. on Gen. 25. 26.

‖ Annot. on Gen. 25 26.

* Annot. on Gen. 32 28

c Esa. 9. 12. Ier. 30. 17. Rem. 9. 6. Mat. 10. 6.

‡ Mal. 1. 2. Ps. 24. 6. & 47. 4. Esa. 44. 5.

that g all things be done vnto edifying? why do you not go
g 1 Cor. 14. 25. before them by telling them your judgement plainely, what you approve, and what you do condemne? 5. Nay, herein you shew lesse zeale and care for the instruction and guiding of the simple and ignorant people, then many of the infidell Rabbines themselves have done: for in their Commentaries vpon the *Thalmud*, when they meete with divers opinions of their doctours, their maner is to tell whose judgement they do follow and approve; as for example in the place which you obiected vnto me to shew that any wise man might advise the Priest, &c. divers opinions of *R. Ismael*, *R. Akiba*, *R. Iehuda* & others being there set downe in the text of the Thalmud, *R. Schimeon* in his glosse thereon "sayth in one section, *vehajnu R. Akiba*, that is, we are of *R. Akiba* his minde: on an other section, *abal rochani*, &c. i. but I respect that which is sayd of *R. Iehuda*: so your *Rambam* or *Maimony* also in his glosse vpon the same Chapter, saith in one section, *vehalacah cachachamim*, that is, the law or traditiō is according to their Chacamim: vpō an other sectiō, *vehalacah cerabbi Iehuda*, that is the tradition or right law is according to *R. Iuda*. And thus also they vse to declare their judgemēts in other places: had you but shewed the like care in your allegation of their traditions, your people should have had lesse cause to cōplaine of your ambiguous expositiōs.

" Comment. on Thal. Tract. negagnim, c. 2.

CHAP. II.

Second scandal and a more vnworthy thing is this; to alledge the testimonies of such as are not onely fabulous but also blasphemous writers, vnlesse it were against themselves and such as rely vpon them. h Doth a fountaine send forth at one place both sweet water and bitter? Can a fig tree bring forth olives or a vine figges? Can those impious Rabbines that with a blasphemous mouth do curse the sonne of God, and pray dayly against the Christians that are renewed after his similitude: Can these I say with the same mouth send forth sweet & whol-

h Iam. 3. 11. 12.

wholsom waters of instructiō for the flock of Christ to drink at? why do you thē lead Christiās for spirituall information in the law of God, vnto that swine-trough of the Thalmud? Even those infidelles themselves do confess and yeeld that there are many things that disable divers persons to beare witnesse & make them *pesulim lehagned*, vnmeet and vnworthy to be allowed for witnesses: *R. Iaakob* that compiled *Arba Turim*, the 4. Tomes of Thalmudicall canons, sets downe many of these causes, as namely "wickednes, enmitye, blindnes deafnes, &c. so that they being wicked enimies of the gospell and of true religion, blinde and deafe that have shut their eyes & stopped their eares from hearing the word of the Lord by his prophets are therfore by their owne sentence to be reiected from bearing any testimony in matters of religion.

"Chot hem hammuleh gat, at sect. Iadath, c. 8. no. 33, 34. 35.

Now their blasphemies are many: To begin with *Maimony*, he saith of God and repeats it, that he is a *one of every side, & on every corner, and every way one*. This he saith by way of oppositiō vnto Christianisme, and so denyes the holy trinitie, and the godhead of Christe, teaching an vnity of person as wel as of essence: Thus where he professeth to describe the foundations of the law, he overthrowes the foundation of our religiō, The holy gospel conteyning the story of Christ, and called *Evangelion* of the good tydings which it declares, they do blasphemously slander, and b call it *Aven gillaion*, a vision of vanity or a volume of Iniquitie. There is no part of that sacred story concerning the birth, the life, the death, the doctrine and miracles of our blessed Lord *Iesus*, but they have a multitude of blasphemies touching ech of them, and so vile that I abhor to mentiō them. One impious Rabbine in speciall in a certaine treatise which he entitles *Nizzachō*, which he intēds as a triūph over the gospel, hath bene bolder then the rest to publish the thelsame, as is c shewed at large in the annotations vpon the Hebrew edition of the gospel of *Mathew*: where they are in part refuted. All men know in generall that they deny Iesus the sonne of Mary, to be the Messias and saviour of the world; and that

a Maim. in Mad. in Iesodeh thorah. Cap. 5.

b R. Nath. in Aruch in Aven gillaion. Elias Lev. in Tischbi, in gillaion.

c Seb. Munst. Annot. in Mat. 1. 1. &c.

that herein the blaſpheme they ſon of God as a deceiver and as a falſe Chriſt. And yet this they do with ſuch vanitie and contradiction among themſelves, that all may ſee their madnes therein: Some of them ſay that their Meſſias is not yet borne, and others ſay he is borne but not reveiled yet, becauſe of their iniquities. Of them that ſay he is borne and come into the world, ſome ſay he is among the Lepers at Roome-gates: and that [d] *R. Iehoſchua ben levi* finding Elias at the gates of Paradiſe & enquiring for the Meſsias, did by his direction finde him among thoſe Lepers, and aſked him of the time when he would reveale himſelf. Others of them ſay, [e] that he is in Paradiſe (to wit, on earth,) being borne the ſame day that the ſecond temple was deſtroyed, and that *Elias* muſt firſt anoynt him for King, and that then he ſhall come, &c. Some of them ſay that there be two Chriſtes or Meſſiaſſes, one the ſonne of *Ioſeph*, an other the ſonne of *David*, one poore, th'other more mighty: Theſe two Meſſiaſſes the [f] *Chalde paraphraſt* will have to be ſignifyed by the two yong roes that feed among the lilies. And divers of the Rabbines do in other places [g] note the ſame thing. Some [h] others of them ſay that King *Hezekias* was the Meſsias, and that now *there is no Meſsias for Iſrael.* And [i] *R. Thanchom* enquiring why *Mem* is ſhut in the word *Lemarbeh* in the prophecy concerning Chriſt *Eſa. 9.* whereas in other places it is open in the middes of words: he ſhewes this to be the occaſion: when as God ſought to make *Hezekias* to be the Meſsias, he ſaith that Sennacherib, Gog and Magog yea and the whole conſiſtory or councel of God came vnto him and ſayd, o Lord of the world, ſeing King *David* hath praiſed thee with ſo many ſongs why wilt thou not make him Meſſias rather then *Hezekias* for whom thou haſt done wonders & yet he hath not ſung one ſong vnto thee: Herevpon he ſaith that immediately the *Mem* in *Lemarbe* was ſhut vp, viz. as a token that *Hezekias* ſhould not be Chriſt: but then after this comes the earth itſelf and opens her mouth and ſaith O Lord of the world I will ſing a hymne vnto thee in ſtead of this

[d] Talmud in Sanhedrin, c. 11. Fol. 98.
[e] Emunath Iehud. p. 44
[f] Targum on Cant. 4. 5.
[g] Aben Ezra & R. Solomon comment. on Zach. 12. 10.
[h] Thalmud Sanhedrin. c. 11. fol. 99
[i] Ibid. f. 94

this righteous *Hezekias*, & ſo herevpon it was concluded that Hezekias ſhould be the Meſsias: Now the proofe which the Thalmud brings to ſhew that the earth did ſing for Hezekias, is taken from *Eſa. 24. 16. from the vttermoſt part of the earth we have heard prayſes, glory to the juſt, &c.* Some of the Rabbines do reckon the yeares & make a computation of times when their Meſsias ſhall come: & this with many and great abſurdities & contradictions among themſelves: Others of them ſeing how oft they have bene deceyved do ſay the times are not to be reckoned: *R. Samuel bar Nachman & R. Ionathan* do lay the curſe vpon ſuch as preſume to reckon the time of his coming, ſaying, [k] *Let their bones be broken that count the times.*

WHereas they [l] blaſpheme Chriſt Ieſus in reſpect of his age, living but three or foure and thirty yeares, as though he was accurſed like the wicked, of whom it is ſayd he ſhall not live out half his dayes: ſee with what warrant & agreement among themſelves they do this: *R. L. cr m* ſaith that the dayes of Meſsias ſhalbe 40. yeares, *according to the yeares that they had ſeene evill*, namely, *according to the 40. yeares that they wandred in the wildernes*, pſ. 90, 15. with pſ. 95. 10. & Deut. 8. 2 *R. Eleazar ben Azaria* ſaith that the yeares of Meſsias muſt be 70. yeares *according to the yeares of one King, Iſa. 23, 15.* That one King they ſay is their Meſsias. One *Rab* ſaith, he muſt live 3. generations, noted in *Dor Dorim*, ſignifying *a generation and generations*, which they reckon for three, pſ. 21. 5. *R. Doſa* ſaith that the dayes of Meſsias muſt be 400. yeares, according to the yeares that they have ſeene evill, viz. according to the 400. yeares that Iſrael ſoiourned in Egypt, *pſ 90, 15. with Gen. 15. 13* An other *Rabbi* ſaith, that the yeares of the Meſsias muſt be 365. according to the number of the dayes of the ſun finiſhing his courſe in a yeare: this they gather *from the yeare of the Lord* mentioned in *Eſa 61. 2. R. Nachman bar Iſaak* ſaith that his yeares muſt be according to the dayes of Noah vntill this time *Eſa. 54. 9. R. Iehudah and R. Samuel* ſay that his dayes ſhalbe as long as from the creation of the world vnto the time preſent

[k] Thal. in Sanhedrin C. 11 f. 97. Seb. Mun. annot. in Mat.
[l] Talmud in Sanhedrin c. 11 fol. 99.

from *Deut.*11.21. Others of them say, that their Messias must live seven thousand yeares: This they gather from the vvords of the Prophet, *As a bridegroome is glad over the bride, so shall thy God reioyce over thee, Esa.*62.5. Now then *glosse* vpō the Talmud in that place shewes vs how to count 7000. out of that verse, by reckoning the 7. dayes of the bridegroomes mariage feast, and making ech day to stand for a yeare, because a 1000 yeares with God is but as one day: and so those 7 dayes do note 7000. yeares, *Iudg.*14.12.17. *With Psal.*90.4. VVhereas they blaspheme the name *Iesus* given by the Angel vnto our Lord, & turne it into a curse, by certaine words according to the initiall letters thereof: see what vaine coniectures & collections they make for other names to be given vnto him: [o] The Schollers of R. *Shiloh* say that the name of Messias shalbe *Shiloh* from *Gen.*49. 10. & the schollers of R. *Iannai* say his name shalbe *Iinnon* from *Psal.*72.17. The schollers of *R. Chanina* say his name shalbe *Chanina* which signifies grace from *Ier.*16.13. Others say his name shalbe *Menachē* or Cōforter frō *Lā.1.16.* But the name *Iesus* they hold in execratiō: so that their blasphemies of his majestie may justly cause their testimonie & judgement in expounding the mysteries of holy scriptures to be refused & not alledged by vs.

Enmishpat glos. in Tal. vbi supra.

[o] Talm. in Sanhedrin, Cap. 11. Fol. 93.

BVt you do not onely alledge them, but even their blasphemous sayings and testimonies also without any note of dislike: as for example, you [p] tell vs how the *Bab. Thalmud in Ioma Cap.1. Fol.21.* speaking of Hag.1.8. vvhere the Hebrew word *Eccabda* (I wilbe glorified) wanteth the letter H, which in numbring signifieth *five*, saith, *The Want of H, sheweth the want of five things in the secōd temple, which had bene in the first, namely, 1. The ark, with the mercie-seat and Cherubims: 2. The fyre (sī heavē) 3. The maiestie or divine presence:) 4 The holy Ghost: 5. And the vrim & Thummim.* This Rabbinicall observation is most impious, false and blasphemous: first, it serves to overthrow the whole new Testament, to deny Christ Iesus, and to condemne all his holy Apostles, Evangelists, Iohn Baptist and other excellent Saints and servants of God who lived vnder the second temple and

[p] Annot. on Exo.28. 30.

and worshipped God therein, as though they all had bene deceyvers & none of them endued with the holy Ghoste, which this Thalmud saith was wanting in the second temple. Secondly, this observation is directly contrary to the scope of that Prophet in his whole prophecie, and even to the meaning of the word *Eccabda I will be glorifyed*: The spirit entending to promise i more full and excellent revelation of the glory and grace of God in this second temple rather then in the first, how abis it so to pervert the word of the Lord quite contrary to his meaning?

[i] Hag.1.8. with Ch.2. 4-10.

But it is the lesse mervaile that you should thus produce this testimony of the Talmud, when as so many learned men have alledged it before you: and especially that [q] worthy light of our Church, whose memorial is blessed, who disputing against the Papists touching the fire come downe frō heaven which in the second book of the Maccabees is sayd to have bene reserved in a pit during the time of the captivitie vntill the second temple was built, doth for their conviction alledge this testimonie, to shew that that fire was vvanting in the second temple, and therfore in a vvhole lecture throughout the same doth labour to procure credit vnto this testimonie. His maine reason is, that howsoever the Iewish vvriters do abound vvith many monstrous lyes and fables, yet when they speak against themselves & the honour of their owne nation, they are rather to be credited, & their testimony receyved. But touching this poynt vve are to consider: 1. VVhen adversaries of the truth bearing vvitnesse against themselves do not agree in that testimony with themselves, then can vve not safely receive their testimony, howvsoever they may bring great shame vpon themselves and may have their mouthes stopped thereby. Novv in this Thalmudicall testimonie touching the vvant of the five things in the second temple, the Thalmudists do not agree among themselves: for the *Thalmud Ierusalemy* alledged by *D. Rai.* reckoned these 5 things to be vvanting: ¶ *the fire: the arke: vrim and Thummim: the anoynting oyle: the holy ghost:* The

[q] Iohn Rainold. contra Hieron. Apocrypha 16. 2. praelect. 134.

[r] Tract. Maccoth, Cap.2. Fol. 32. col.1.

Talmud Babylonique of vvhich D. Rai. confeſſeth he could not come to the ſight of it) leaves out *the anoynting oyle* and * reckons vp five or rather 7. other things: *the ark, the mercy-ſeat, the Cherubims, the fire, the divine preſence, and vrim & Thummim:* R. *David Kimchi* "ſpeaking of the five things that ſhould be wanting, doth neither reckon the anoynting oyle, nor the mercy-ſeat, nor the Cherubims: *R. Solomon Iarchi* in his "reckoning omits the anoynting oyle, the mercy-ſeat, the Cherubims and the ark alſo: ſo that vnleſs he count vrim and Thummim for two, which none of the former did, he muſt come ſhort of the number of five. *Aben Ezra* in his commentaries on the ſame place omits this myſterie, & thinks it not meet to make any mention at all thereof. Againe the *Thalmud Ieruſalemy* relates this matter from R. Samuel in the name of *R. Acha* (not *Achar* as is printed in the lecture above mentioned:) but the *Babylonian Thalmud* relates it from R. Samuel in the name of R. *Aini*. and therein diſagrees alſo. And other differences there are betwixt them alſo, ſo that for this cauſe their credit is like the credit of thoſe // diſagreeing witneſſes that roſe vp againſt Chriſte.

2. Thoſe witneſſes which ſo ſpeak againſt themſelves, that they do vvithall ſpeak againſt the honour of Chriſt therein, are not to be credited: but the Rabbines in this place affirming the *holy Ghoſt* to be vvanting in the ſecond temple, do herein ſpeak againſt Chriſt, and make him (that a receyved the holy Ghoſt & b communicated the ſame vnto others more then ever before) to be inferiour vnto all the Prophets that went before. If this Thalmudicall teſtimony touching the want of theſe 5. things in the ſecond temple vvere true, according to the meaning of the Rabbines, then could not Ieſus be the true Meſſias.

3, It might eaſily be ſhewed by an 100. inſtances, that theſe Rabbines do often ſpeak falſely againſt the honour of their owne nation, and againſt the vvorthieſt men of God in their nation, to honour themſelves vvith the invention of ſome Cabaliſticall conceit: though to the diſ honour of Abraham, of Iaakob, of Samuel, of David, Hezekias, Eliſha, &c. Yet to magnify

* In Ioma. c. 1. f. 21.

"Commēt. in Hag. 1, 8

"Commēt. Ibid.

// Mark. 14 56.

a Mat. 3. 16 Ioh. 3. 34.

b Ioh. 16. 13, 14. Act. 2, 4.

nify their owne fictions, they tell many fabulous things touching the faults of theſe perſons. And ſo to broch their curious & abſurd conceit from *Eccabda* vnder ſhew of a great myſterie, it is no marvel, nor vnvſuall thing if the deviſers thereof ſhould vtter ſome things againſt the honour of their publique eſtate, eſpecially when thoſe priviledges which they take from the ſecond temple, are given in the ſame place to the firſt temple, for the honour of their nation at that time. As for the antiquity of theſe Talmuds, and *Rabboth* that relate this teſtimony, it gives no more credit herevnto then vnto the reſt of their fables and impious traditions: And therfore is of no worth further then it receives confirmation from els where: or ſerves by way of ſuppoſition to convince ſuch as rely vpon the ſame.

CHAP. III.

THe third Scandall in the allegation of theſe Thalmudicall traditions, is in reſpect of the divine honour which the Iewes give vnto them, holding that they are the very word of God, immediately delivered of God vnto *Moſes* in mount Sinai, when as he was 40. dayes and 40 nights in the mount with God. It is not enough for them to profeſs, teach and practiſe ſuch fabulous, ſuperſtitious and blaſphemous things, vnleſs they obtrude them vpon God, equalling them with the holy ſcriptures and preferring them before the writings of the Prophets. They tell vs that there is a double lavv, *thorah ſchebicthab*, a vvritten law: *thorah ſchebeal peh*, a law in the mouth: which *Moſes* did receive but not write, onely delivering it from mouth to mouth vnto poſteritie: And this is their Thalmud. *R. Aben Ezra* in his preface to the commentaries vvhich he vvrote on the lavv calleth it *the ioy of their heart and the health of their bones*, & ſaith *there is no difference* betwixt theſe two lawes. *R. Solomon Iarchi* "teacheth, that the *ordinances and lawes which the Lord commanded*

"Commēt. on Deut 4. 14.

ded Moſes to teach Iſrael Deut. 4. 14. vvere this traditional law, thorah *ſchebeal peh*, the law delivered by mouth and not vvritten: though now at laſt the Iewes have vvritten the ſame. *Maimony* to ſhevv the dignitie and excellencie of theſe traditions, ·/· alledgeth that ſaying from Hab. 3. 6, his vvayes are everlaſting; but (ſaith he) read not, *halicoth*, vvayes: but *halacoth* traditions. And ſaith, whoſoever teacheth thoſe traditions let him be aſſured that he is a child of the vvorld to come. That Targum or *Chaldee paraphraſt* which you often alledge, doth interpret thoſe *kiſſes of the mouth*, *Cant. 1. 1.* to be the ſix parts of the Thalmud: and afterwards againe moſt abſurdly "ſpeaks of the ſame, deſiring to ſerve that God, which in the day being clothed with a robe white as ſnow ſtudyeth the 24. bookes of the Bible, and in the night ſeaſon ſtudieth the ſix parts of the Thalmud. And the *Thargum Ieruſalemy* expounds thoſe words of Iaakob in his bleſſing of Iuda, that his ·/· *teeth* ſhould be *white with milke*, of ſuch as are *bakian bahalacah* exerciſed in the tradition of the Thalmud. And further that they prefer their Thalmud before the holy ſcriptures, it appeares by ſuch ſayings as are // noted to be ordinary among the Rabbines: namely, that the words of their vviſe men were more amiable and excellent then the words of the Prophets that the ſcripture or text of the Bible is to be compared vnto *water*: the miſchna, (which is one part of the Talmud) vnto *wine*: & the Thalmud (or Gemara) vnto *Condite*: that the law is like vnto *ſalt*, the miſchna like vnto *Pepper* & the Thalmud like vnto *ſweet ſpices*. If this be ſo, it is no marvel that you do ſo ſugar and ſpice your annotatiõs with the traditiõs of theſe vviſe men. It is affirmed in the ·/· Thalmud, that to be exerciſed in the ſcriptures it is *a vertue & no vertue*, that is very ſmall in cõpariſon: to be exerciſed in the miſchna, that is *a vertue for which they receyve a reward*: to be exerciſed in the Gemara, (which is an other part of the Thalmud) is *a vertue, then which none is more excellent*. *R. Solomon* expounding thoſe words of Moſes touching the ſubmiſsiõ vnto the) judgement of the Prieſts and Iudges in Iſrael, that it was

·/· In miſneh, in tephil. col haſſhanah.

"Thargum on Cant. 5. 10.

·/· on Gen. 49. 12.

// Buxtorf. recenſ. operis Tal. p. 197. 202

·/· In Babha metſia f. 2. Fol. 33

was not to be declined from neither to the right hand nor to the left, doth herevpon teach, that they are to be obeyed and followed, "*When they ſay that the right hand is the left, or that the left hand is the right hand: and hovv much more when they ſay that the right hand is the right hand, and that the left hand is the left hand?* Thus do they ſet men in the ſeat of God, and make vile fleſh like vnto the moſt high, yea and exalt them into a throne of dignitie above him. In this regard it is more offenſive to alledge ſuch counterfaite ſtuffe as doth faſly beare the name of God, as if it were ſuggeſted by his divine and extraordinary inſpiration. In the popiſh legends there are many fained viſions and mirackles recorded, and ſome of them deviſed onely to perſwade vnto mercy and workes of charitie: yet do vve juſtly abhor them and the vſe of them to any ſuch end, becauſe they are forged with the great abuſe of Gods name: for the Kingdome of God needs not to be vpholden with any props or pillars borowed from the Kingdom of Satan. He that being to beare witneſſe of any matter, ſhall firſt be convicted of a lye touching the meanes of his knowledge, and touching the perſon from whom he pretends he heard that which he is to vvitneſſe, even for this cauſe deſerves to be condemned and to have his teſtimony reiected: And even ſo the Thalmudiſts being herein manifeſtly guilty of a notorious & blaſphemously touching the meanes of their knowledg, while they pretend a divine revelation from God for all that they ſay, though he never delivered the ſame vnto any: for this cauſe is their teſtimony alſo to be refuſed except it be againſt themſelves. And for this cauſe alſo your boldnes and your fault in frequent alledging of them, is the more inexcuſable,

" Comment. on Deut. 17. 11.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

A Fourth Scandall, is your forgerie in the allegation of theſe Rabbines, and this in divers kindes.

First, in that you joyne with the Iewes in making divers of their traditions to be part of the authentique word of God: and namely, in canonizing the divers readings that are in the line and in the magine of the Maſorites Bible: for example, *in* לֹא *not*, *&* לוֹ *to himſelf: not betrothed her*, and yet *betrothed her to himſelf*: of theſe you ſay, "*Moſes hearing it of God, did by his ſpirit, write both.* Before this time, I never heard of any Chriſtian, that durſt avouch ſo peremptorily, this preſumptuous or rather blaſphemous aſſertion, by which you make God like vnto *Ianus Bifrons* the Idoll with two faces, to look two divers vvayes at once, in theſe divers and contrary readings of the ſame text. Do you not remember what a fearfull curſe is pronounced againſt theſe that adde vnto the book of God? why then do you bring theſe additions and maintaine them, as the worke of Gods ſpirit? It is great ſin to adde vnto the vvritings of men, and to put forth things in their name, whereof they are not authors: but much more to deale ſo with God. It is a poynt of treaſon againſt the King to counterfait his hand, his ſeale, his coyne: how much more to counterfait the hand and writing of God, to coyne new ſcripture, and to ſet the ſtampe of the Rabbines vpon the coyne of the Lord, by adding their traditions vnto his word, and giving divine authoritie vnto them? But it is the leſſe marvell that you who erre ſo ſtrangely in diſcerning the Church of God, ſhould alſo erre in diſcerning the ſcriptures of God.

" Annot. on Exo. 21 8.

‖ Prov. 30. 6. Rev. 22. 18

You plead, that *the Hebrew hath both readings, the firſt in the line, the later in the margine*: I anſwer. 1. There be many Hebrew Bibles: which do want theſe readings that you ſpeak of: That ancient edition of the Hebrew Bible by *Sebaſtian Munſter* hath them not: That great edition of the Hebrew by *Plantine* hath not theſe additions in the margine: The moſt excellent and divers editions hereof by *Rob. Stephanus* both in 4° and in 16°, have them not. A new edition of *Raphelengius* hath them not. The late edition by *R. Iſaak Bar Shimeon* hath thē not: ſo that we may ſay with as good reaſon as you, that the Hebrew hath them not, 2. That Maſoriticall Bible of *Bomberg*, that hath theſe divers readings, hath alſo ſo many other traditionall obſervatiōs, in the margine thereof round about, that I think you will be loth to afme them to be receyved from God & written by his ſpirit & yet that Maſoriticall bible which maintevneth theſe divers readings delivers one ſort of traditions as well as the other, and puts no difference betwixt them. 3. There are alſo ſundry editions of the new Teſtamēt, which have divers readings, one in the line, an other in the margine, yet can we not hence conclude that both theſe readings are receyved from God: and yet may we ſay of theſe as well as you do of the other, that *the Greek hath both readings, &c.* though onely one of them were delivered by the ſpirit extraordinarily from God. And even ſo, *Arias Montanus* in his edition of the Hebrew Bible, though he have noted the divers readings in the margine, yet not as if they were delivered by the ſpirit of God; but as " ſalts growne by the calamitie of times, the negligence and ignorance of ſcribes, or otherwiſe, &c.

" Annot. Ibid.

" In apparatu Bibl. præfat. ad lect. var.

You alledge further, that *the Writing differeth in the eye,* (לוֹ, not; and " lo, to himſelf) *but hath no difference in the eare: ſo Moſes hearing it of God, did by his ſpirit, write both.* Anſw. 1, how know you that there vvas no difference of ſound in Moſes his eare, when he heard thoſe words whoſe letters do differ? vvant of a diſtinct ſound, in words that ſignify diſtinct and ſeverall things is an imperfection of ſpeech, and a defect in the language: but now the language ſpokē vnto Moſes being Hebrew which is the perfecteſt language: the Lord that ſpake, ſpeaking after a moſt perfect maner: and Moſes that heard being prepared therevnto of God, after the moſt perfect maner that was

needfull for the receyving of that law; who is it now, that can justly affirme, that at this time distinct words had an indistinct & confused sound without any difference in the eare?

2. Though the common rule of grammar at this day teach that those two "letters are quiescent or silent and not pronounced in the end of vvords, yet are there still some exceptiõs made by some, and the other "two being of like nature for the pronunciation are by many learned men pronounced in like case in the end of vvords.

"Aleph, vau.

"He, jod.

Some write that these *quiescent* letters as they are called, do cause a different pronuntiation, in making the vowelles vnto which they are joyned to be drawne out with a longer founde and therfore are by them called a *literæ flatus & protractionis*. Others tell vs that b *Cholem* hath six or seven differẽt kindes of sounds according to the diversitie of letters with which it is joyned, and in particular what distinct and peculiar kinde of sound it hath in *lo, not*: and how it differs from *Cholem* in other places. And if this be so, how can any man affirme that there was no difference in the eare betwixt *lo, not*, & *lo, to himself*, whẽ Moses heard them of God?

a Val. Schind. Institut. Hebr. lib. 1. p 12.

b Ioa. Drusius de recta lectione ling. Sanct. cap. 8.

3. This your distinction of difference in the eye, and no difference in the eare seemes to be very idle, and of no vse to give any light vnto the matter that you are speaking of: you can not pretend the like distinction to bring in some other of the divers readings noted by the Masorites, seing many of them do manifestly differ in the eare, as much or more then in the eye. To vvhat purpose then serveth this distinction?

4. If there be litle or no difference of sound betwixt these words, this is the more against you: and helpes to make it more apparant that these and the like divers readings did arise from the errour of the scribes that wrote out the copies of the Bible, which might easily be deceyved in those words, which by their sound were not distinguished from one an other. And thus also from the likenes of the figure in divers letters, as in *vau* & *Iod*, it is observed that c *in writing of them one hath degenerated into the*

c Io. Buxtorf. Thesaur. gram. lib. 1. c. 28

to the other. And if we look vpon those seven classes or rankes, wherevnto d *Elias Levita* hath reduced these divers readings, we may thereby plainely observe that they are all such, as through some similitude either in sound, in figure, or in signification or through transposition, coniunction, or division of the letters, or the like occasion the pen of the scribe might quickly slip and misse therein: for example to give instance in two like letters: he telles vs that *in 52 places of these divers readings*, jod *is written in the beginning of a word, and the Masorites will have it be read* vau: *And on the contra in 56. places* vau *is written in the beginning of a word and they read it* jod: *Againe in 70. places* jod *is written in the middes of a word and they read it & pronounce it as* vau, &c. And hence as it seemeth, Rabbinicall superstition and curiositie meeting with these divers readings have turned humane slips and errours into sacred mysteries, & given divine authoritie vnto the faults of men. As the Pope in his Kalender many times canonizeth thẽ for Saints, who are the Children of Hell: so have the Iewes in their *Masorah* turned the errours of men into Canonicall scripture. VVhy do you follow them herein?

d Masoreth hammasoreth in Tabulis sectũdis, Orat. 1.

FOr confirmation of your opinion, you produce witnesses, & say, *The Hebrew Doctours (in Thalmud Bab. in Nedarim, Chap. 4 Fol. 37. B) say, The words read and not written, and written and not read, were the tradition of Moses from (mount) Sinai: that is, as the Hebrew Scholion on that place noteth, so Moses receyved in Sinai, & delivered to Israel.* Ianswer,

1. These witnesses being already convicted of falshood, dotages and blasphemies are not to be admitted to speak in this controversie, their testimonie is not to be receyved. This Thalmud which you alledge, is that bed of slumber into which the Lord had f threatned to cast the Iewes: in this bed of errour do your Hebrew Doctours lye snorting in the spirit of slumber: vvhat meane you to waken them and call them vp to come and tell vs their dreames? You may as well alledge their testimonie, to make vs beleeve that their Thalmudicall

f Esa. 29. 10. Rom. 11. 8

canons and constitutions , are from God as well as the holy scriptures,and that we are bound to exercise ourselves in them, rather then in the scriptures: for this they affirme as I shewed before. And there is no tradition so impious or absurd,but the Thalmudists commend the same vnto vs, even with the same phrase , that is here vsed in this your allegation. At every turne they say, f *Halacah lemoshe misinai.* i. *a tradition of Moses from* (*mount*) *Sinai*. VVith this cloak they aray their superstitions , and with this false boasting they sell their Rabbinicall wares. How great is the scandall which you give vnto the Iewes by this your dealing? how may they be encouraged to drink more deepely of that spiced cup of their Thalmud , when as they see the wine thereof to go downe so pleasantly with you , by receiving their testimonie and their traditions in so great a measure?

f Thalmud in Menachorh.c.1. Fol.29. Maimony in Tephillim, cap.1. Sec.3. R. Alphes in Tephillim,fol.78. a.b , & 79. a.b, &c.

2. If there vvere nothing els but the foolish traditions cõteyned in this very Chapter vnto which you send vs,touching *Ben Modar* with other vaine observations ; vve might thereby be sufficiently warned not to receive the testimony of this Thalmud. *R.Iosei bar Chanina* g saith, The law vvas not givẽ but vnto *Moses* & to his seed,because it was sayd, *Write thee & engrave for thee two tables of stone*, but *Moses* having a good ey: of his liberality gave it to Israel,&c. *R.Iochanan* saith in the same place, The holy blessed God doth not cause his *schecinah* or habitatiõ to abide but vpõ a strõg mã, a rich mã, a wise mã & an hũble mã, & that all these were in *Moses*: that he was a strõg mã, because it is sayd, *he spread the covering over the tabernacle,&c.* Exo.40.19. This same thing is also noted by h *R.Solomon* from *R. Tanchuma*, that no mã had the strẽgth to do this thing but *Moses* alone,&c. That he was strong also , in that he could beare the two tables of stone in his hand,that he could break them , the length of them being six, the breadth six , and the thicknes thirteen cubites,&c. That he was vvise ; that all the 50 gates of vnderstanding were given vnto *Moses*, one excepted; that they prove from ps.8.5. That he vvas meek from Numb,12.3. That he was

g Thalm. in Nedarim, c.4. f.38.a

h Comment. on Exo.39 33.

was rich from Numb. 16. 15. So they write of divers others : as of *Ionah* whom they prove to be rich , because he payd the fare of the ship:Ion. 1. 3. *R.Iohanan* saith it vvas the hyre of the whole ship : *R.Romanus* saith it came to foure thousand pieces of gold,&c. vvith a number of such like presumptions.

3. There be also of the Rabbines themselves that reiect this superstitious conceit of these divers readings delivered vnto Moses from mount Sinai. *R. David Kimchi* one of the learnedest and most judicious among them all,though he ascribe too much vnto their Kabalah and tradition , yet he judgeth that these divers writings and readings came from the dispersion of the Iewes , from the difference of copies written by divers scribes: and that *Ezra* and the men of the great congregation (as they are called) in correcting the copies vvhen they found difference , went according to their knowledge after the greatest number , and when they did not clearely vnderstand some wordes , sometimes they wrote them and did not poynt them : sometimes they wrote one way in the margent , and did not write so in the text , &c. And this is the judgement of other Rabbines also as of *Ephodeus*, and *Don Isaak Abarbinel* or *Abrabinael* , that this diversity of writing and reading arose from *hephsed, balbul* & *Saphek*, that is , from corruption, confusion, doubting and vncertainty of scribes,&c. This is acknowledged by k *R.Iacob ben Chajim*, vvho in vaine labours to refute them. Had you but cleaved vnto the sounder sort of Rabbines you should not have gone so far astray.

i Kimchi Preface vnto Iothua.

k Preface to Mikrotes Bible.

4. It is worthy to be observed also , that the very same testimony alledged by you frõ the Thalmud, *Nedar.c.4 f.37.* is that maine stone of offence, whereat the later Rabbines have stumbled and fallen into the pit of superstition , and therfore is it so oft cited by them ; viz. by l *R. Moses mikkotsi* : by m *R. Iacob ben Chajim*: by n *Elias Levita*,&c. Had you duely considered in what superstitious maner they vse the same, and how it serves their turne , you would not so lightly have produced such vvitnesse.

l Preface ad Sepher mitsvoth gadol.

m Preface ad Bibl. masoret.

n Masor hammasor. prefat. ter-

5. To come neerer vnto this your testimony itself : if vve ta-

consider the instances and examples of the vvords vvriten and not read: and read and not written, which the o Thalmud pro-
o In Nedarim, c. 4. f. 37.
pounds vnto vs as a *tradition of Moses from mount Sinai*: we may perceive that there is never a one of them taken from the law, from the five bookes of *Moses*, but all of them from later Prophets, from the bookes of *Ruth*, *of Samuel*, *Kings*, *of Ieremie and Ezekiel*. If your witnesse had sayd that *Moses* had delivered the divers vvritings and readings of his owne bookes, there had bene some more colour for it, but that *Moses* in mount Sinai should deliver the divers writings and readings of *Ezekiel and Ieremie* that propheseyed so many generations after him: this is most senseless and absurd to imagine. Had not *Ieremy and Ezekiel* the spirit of God to direct them in the vvriting of those particular vvords, as vvel as to set downe the maine matters of their propheseye vvhich they foretold? And vvhat need vvas there then of a tradition from *Moses*, for the vvriting or reading of them? And vvho can say that *Moses* foreknew these things? Though the Masorites have numbred vnto vs many divers writings and readings out of the bookes of *Moses*, yet the Thalmud in your allegation mentions none of them, but such as are in the Prophets.

6. Suppose all vvere true that the Thalmud and the glosse therevpon doth testify in this place: namely that these divers readings were the *tradition of Moses from mount Sinai*, *&c.* yet would not this make good your assertion nor prove the same, vvhen as you say that *Moses* by the spirit of God did *vvrite both*: The Thalmud here saith nothing of *vvriting* one vvord in the text, and an other in the margine. The Rabbines here speak onely of receyving and delivering, but not of *vvriting both*.
Elias Levita Masoreth hammasoreth, præfat. 3.
p They hold that their traditions vvere nor vvritten by *Moses*, but delivered from mouth to mouth and aftervvards vvritten by *Ezra* and others, &c. Herein therfore you go further then your Thalmudicall testimonie vvill extend, & passe the bounds of sobrietie in this your assertion, more then many of the presumptuous Rabbines themselves.

7. If

7. If it vvere true, as you plead, that Keri and Chethib, *the divers readings* (as you call them) as *not betrothed her and betrothed her to himself*, vvere both vvritten by *Moses*, by the spirit of God: then are they both holy and divine scripture: then do you herein declare your self to be guilty of great sin, treachery and vnfaithfull dealing vvith the scriptures, in that you do leave out divers parts of the same at your pleasure in your translation both of the psalmes and of these tvvo first bookes of Moses vvhich you have already published: for though some of these divers readings be noted by you in your annotations on Genesis, yet are many of them quite left out: as namely, in *Gen.* 8.17. and *Gen.*10.19, and *Gen.*25.23, and *Gen.*27.3, and *Gen.*33.4, and *Gen.*36.5, &c. Againe in your translation of Exodus you leave out very many also, as in *Exo.*13.11 and *Exo.*16.2. and *Ibid. vers.*8, &c. And in your translation of the Psalmes, though divers be noted by you, yet are a great number left out, and passed by, as in *Ps.*5.9, and *Ps.*64, and *Ps.*10.10. and *Ps.*123.4, and Ps. 139.16. vvith a multitude more as may be seene in the Masorites Bible, onely one of these readings are mentioned by you, and yet there is as much & the same vvarrant for both in ech of these places, as there is for both those in *Exo.*21,8, vvhich you say vvere vvritten by Moses. This being so, hovv great is your sacriledge that devoure holy things, and steale avvay the vvord of God (so acknovvledged by yourself) from the people of God. There is n *gold and a multitude of precious stones, but the lippes of knowledge are a precious Iewell:* ech jod and title of holy scripture vvritten by the spirit of God, are in vvorth above all pearles, vvhat meane you then vvith *Achan* to dig in the earth, to hide these vvedges of gold in the ground and to bury them in your tent? Consider your estate: either you are vnder the curse for adding some of the readings vnto the vvord of God, or els it hangs over your head for diminishing from the vvord of God, in taking avvay and concealing the rest, that are of like authoritie vvith the former. The Rabbines * vvrite that *jod* being taken avvay from
n Prov. 20. 15.
* R. Solomon Iarchi on Gen. 17. 5.

ſtom the name *Sarai* contended vvith Schecinah, vvith God vntill ſatisfaction vvas made vnto this *Iod* by adding it againe vnto the name of *Hoſea* making it to be *Iehoſhua*: How much rather might many *jods* contend with you for taking them away from the holy ſcripture, if they be divine traditions as you ſay? The Iewes do alſo "write, the word *jitſer* vſed to deſcribe the *forming* of man, being written with two *jods*, *Gen.* 2. 7. doth ſhew vnto vs how man was formed both for this vvorld and for the world to come at the reſurrection of the dead: but the word *jitſer* vſed to deſcribe the *forming* of beaſts, *Gen.* 2. 17. being in the Hebrew written with one *Iod* onely, ſhewes that the beaſts are not formed to ſtand vp vnto judgement in the world to come. If this be ſo, what a world of injury and wrong have you done, by omitting it ſo often? Yea ſeing Chriſt himſelf telleth vs,[a] that heaven and earth ſhall periſh, rather then one *jod* or title of his law eſcape, &c. ſhall not heaven & earth be witneſſe againſt you that do let ſo many of thoſe *jods* and titles to eſcape and paſſe away in your tranſlation, when as yet you confeſſe that they vvere vvritten by the ſpirit of God? why have you not tranſlated the reading of the margent, & ſet it in the margent of your tranſlation, as wel as the reading of the text, if both be from the ſpirit of God? why have you not done it in other places, as wel as in this place *Exo.* 21. 8? But it may be that as in many things you honour the Iewiſh expoſitions and opinions too much, that ſo you Iudaize in this alſo: that as they, ſo you think it not meet to reveale in writing many of your ſpeciall myſteries and ſecrets vnto them that are without, but deliver them from mouth to mouth vnto your owne people. Seing the communion of all Churches in Chriſtendome is according to your profeſsion an vnlawfull and an vncleane thing, it is the leſſe marvell that you refuſe to caſt your pearles before ſuch polluted perſons whom you dare not touch nor joyne yourſelf vnto them in the worſhip of God. Alwayes theſe two things are evident and apparant in you, that as you make litle conſcience of the rules of your ſeparation among

"R. Sol on Gen. 2. 7.

a Mat. 5. 18.

among your ſelves, for then there would be yet more diviſions among you then there are: ſo alſo you make litle conſcience of theſe divers readings, which you ſay were written by Moſes: for if you did reverence them according your owne plea, you would not paſſe by ſo many of them in ſuch maner as you do.

8. Suppoſe that yow would go about to ſet downe all the divers readings, how could you come to any certainty, to know which be they? In the place of the Thalmud quoted by you, there be not above twelve or thirteene mentioned: and this of *Io, not*: *and Io, to himſelf* is none of them. VVhere vvill you find thoſe other hundreds of them? If you betake yourſelf vnto the Maſorites Bible, from whence many have taken them you may as wel take a thouſand ſuperſtitions more which by like warrant are there recorded vnto vs as divine traditions. VVhereas you tell vs here of the *Hebrew ſcholion* confirming the teſtimony of the Thalmud: had you looked well vpon the ſame, you might further have ſeene this alſo, that the very ſame hebrew [b] gloſſe doth there diſſent from the Thalmud, touching ſome of theſe divers readings: Touching *eth* dehuggad (as they call it) in Ruth; though the Thalmud note it to be *read and not written*, yet the *Hebrew ſcholion* ſaith, *In the bookes or copies which we have it is both written & read: neither is it mentioned in the Maſorah among the words that are read and not writtē.* Againe, touching *eth* dehammitſvah (as they call it) though the Thalmud notes it among the words *written and not read*, yet *R. Niſſim* in his [c] gloſs hereupon doth ſhew, that howſoever ſome ſay this is found in the ſection of the law which they name *ethchannan*, yet it is not found there in any copies which they have, nor yet in the Maſora, &c. *R. Iacob ben Chajim* [d] relates the ſame thing, and addes further a different opinion of *R. Solomon Iarchi* about the ſame. And *Elias Levita* in the warning which he [f] gives concerning the Bibles printed at *Venice* both in greater and leſſer volumes, *anno* 278 (according to the Iewes leſſer computation,) ſaith that the Maſoriticall traditions

[b] R. Niſſim gloſs. in Talm. in Nedarim. c. 4. f. 37.

[c] Ibidem. f. 38.

[d] Præfat. ad Bibl. Maſorit.

[f] Maſor. hammaſ. præfat. 3.

ditions about the divers readings there ſpecified are full of errour, that he which added them was vnlearned, had no judgement touching divers copies, that he put that in the text which ſhould have bene in the margent, and contra, &c. From whence then vvill you get a juſt and ſufficient warrant of all theſe divers readings, which you hold to be divine traditions written by the ſpirit of God?

9. VVhen you think that you have found out theſe divers readings, & are reſolved of the number of them: what vvill you do to finde out the meaning of them? every vvord of God is for
g Prov. 8. 9 the ædification of his Church: and g *they are all plaine to them that will vnderſtand & ſtraight to them that would finde knowledge*:
h Neh. 8. 8 God hath taught vs how to h expound the ſcripture by the ſcripture itſelf, by comparing one part thereof vvith an other. But where is the rule of interpretation, by which we may finde out the myſteries of theſe divers readings? for example, vvhen *Zeboim Gen. 10. 19. gojim*, *Gen. 25. 23.* and *Ieuſh*, *Gen. 36. 5.* are written in the text vvithout *vau* and in the margine with *vau*: vvhen the vowelles for the word *Perath* are vvritten and not the letters, *2. Sam. 8. 3.* VVhen the letters of the vvord *Iidroch* are vvritten and not the vowels, *Ierem. 51. 3.* by vvhat ſound kinde of interpretation can both theſe writings be ſo expounded, that the conſciences of Gods people may reſt therein, and be edifyed vnto the Kingdome of God? If we go vnto the Iewes Cabala, they will give vs new and ſtrange kinde of expoſitions vpon the want or change of a letter; becauſe i *theomim* the word that ſignifyeth *twinnes* Gen. 25. 24. is written in the text with defect of the letter which is in the margine, that is a ſigne that one of *Rebekahs* Children was juſt and the other wicked: but becauſe the vvord *theomim* for twinnes is written full in the ſtory of *Thamar*, *Gen.* 38. 27. that was a ſigne that both her Children ſhould be righteous. They expound k the vvant of *Iod* in the laſt ſyllable of *Tanninim* ſignifying the *whales Gen.* 1. 21. to be a ſigne vnto vs how God gelded the male *Leviathan* to hinder the procreation of them leaſt they ſhould devoure all,

i R. Solomon Iar. on Gen. 25. 24. & on Gē. 38. 27.

k Ioan. Rainol. cenſur. lib. apocr. tom. 1. prælec. 27.

all, &c. From the defect of *vau* in *doroth Gen.* 9. 12. they teach that the Rainebovv ſhould not be ſeene in ſome generations, as I noted l before: But vvhat vviſe man is there that vvill not reiect theſe vanities? And yet vvhether you or any other can dravv any ſounder obſervations from theſe changes of *jod* and *vau* and ſuch like divers readings, it is much to be feared. If theſe vvere vvritten by the ſpirit of God as you vvill have it, then muſt they be for our m learning and inſtruction, for encreaſe of our comfort and hope: but if you cannot ſhevv that there is a certaine and ſure vvay to gather neceſſary doctrine from them for our edification, then have vve no reaſon to think vvith you that they are any part of the ſcriptures of God, or vvritten by the ſpirit of God.

l Pag. 146.

m Rō. 15. 4

10. In the laſt place, that all may ſee how dangerous a thing it is to regard the teſtimony of theſe Thalmudiſts, touching theſe divers readings, I vvill propound vnto the reader one other vile practiſe of them, viz. their *al tikri* in changing and altering the reading of the ſcripture according to their luſt, which is done on this maner: They n teach from thoſe words in Eſay, 26. 4. *bejah jehovah tſur ghnolamim*, that God created two vvorlds vvith the two letters of the vvord *jah*; with *jod* and *hè*: but being in doubt whether the world to come was created with *jod* and the vvorld preſent vvith *hè*; or on the contrary: for help in this doubt they go to an other place of ſcripture *Gen.* 2. 4. vvhich they do thus corrupt: whereas it is there ſayd in the text touching heaven and earth, *behibbaream*, *When they were created*: they ſay *al tikri*, *read not*, *behibbaream*, but *behè baream*: that is, he created them with *hè*: and then alſo they give other reaſons why the world to come ſhould be created vvith *jod*, & this world with hè; viz. becauſe the righteous which belong to the world to come are litle in their owne eyes, and alſo bowed downe, as the letter *Iod* in this forme (י) is litle & bowed alſo, &c. Theſe collections, (beſide the corruption of the text) are like vnto the o collections of Thomas Leamar once one of your ſeparation, but now an Arian, who by his cabala from the letters &

n Thalmud in Menachoth, c. 1. Fol. 29.

o Vertoninghe. Fol. 20. B.

characters of the Hebrew Alphabet professeth to shew vs the course of the sun, the waye to the Indies, vvith other secrets of Astronomie. Againe, they p write that the stone which *Og* the King of Bashan sought to cast at the Israelites, vvas three miles long according to the length of their campe: that when he had lift this stone vpon his head, God sent a pismire vvhich made a hole in this stone, so that it fell downe about his neck: and that while *Og* strove to get it from about his neck, his teeth presently grew out into such a length, that he could not lift vp the stone nor deliver himself from it; for proofe of this miracle, they alledge the q words of the psalmist, *thou hast broken the teeth of the wicked*: but vvithall they bring their *al-tikri*, and say, read not *schibbarta*, thou hast broken: but *scherababta*, vvhich signifies the quite contrary, to vvit, thou hast encreased or augmented, namely the teeth of *Og*, that the stone could not be got from his neck. *R. Meir* * saith, vvhen Israel stood by the Sea, (Exo. 14.) the tribes did strive one vvith an other, one sayd I vvill go dovvne first into the Sea: an other sayd I vvill descend first into the Sea; but the tribe of *Beniamin* lept forth & vvent dovvne first into the Sea; their proofe there is from the words of the Psalme, *There vvas little Beniamin*, Rodem, *their ruler*: But say they, *al-tikri*, read not, *rodem*, but *radiam* he descended into the Sea. This proofe is some thing like vnto your ovvne " exposition of this very vvord, vvhen as you also from the corrupt Greek version, vvhich translateth this vvord *rodem* to signify *in a traunce*, do there tell vs that *these things applyed to Christs times and after are very mystical*; from hence you shevv hovv Paul of Beniamin *vvas converted in a traunce or ecstasie*, &c. that *Beniamin the least is here put first: so in the heavenly Ierusalem the first foundation vvas a Iasper, on vvhich Beniamins name vvas graven*, &c. Of this your revelation, ecstasy or Phantasy more is to be sayd " hereafter. This kinde of corrupting the text is ordinary vvith them: some examples hereof I noted before out of the r *Thalmud* and s *Maimony*; and an 100. more might easily be alledged to shevv the same. *Elias Levita* t bringing an exam-

p Thalmud In Beracoth c. 9. Fol. 54.

q Psal. 3.7

* Thalmud in Sorah, c. 7. f. 37.

" Annot. on Psal. 68 28.

" Cap. 7.

r Pag. 379.
s Pag.
t Masor. hammasor. prefa. 3.

example or tvvo hereof *Esa.* 54.13, & *Psal.* 50.23, vvhere they say *al-tikri*, read not *banajic* thy Children: but *bonajic* thy builders: read not *sam derec* he that disposeth his vvay, but *scham derec*, there is the vvay: he giveth this judgement herevpon, viz. that if the pricks or vovvels had bene given before from Sinai, that then this should have bene a heynous practise. And therfore seing the vowels are so ancient, and seing also that they have presumed to make this change as vvell in letters as in pricks, as the examples first mentioned do shew, it doth therfore follow from his grant, that this *al tikri* or changing of the reading hath bene a heynous corruption of the scripture. And therfore howsoever otherwise, they have bene superstitious in keeping a reckoning of all the vvords and letters in the scripture: and that God also hath vsed their superstition vnto our good in some things: yet their boldnes and licentiousnes in these kind of depravations makes that their testimony about the reading of the scripture is not to be rested vpon.

BVt you bring yet more vvitnesse for the countenancing of your assertion, and say, u *The Chaldee version in this and other the like places, translateth according to the margine: an evident proof that these divers readings were not added by the Masorites, as some think: seing the Masorites were not so ancient.*

u Annot on Exo. 21. 8.

I answer: First, this testimony is against yourself: for if the *Chaldee version* in this and other the like places, translate according to the margine, and that onely (as it doth) or els according to the text onely: then doth it afford vnto vs, not both the divers readings, but one onely: and so is contrary to your translation that yeelds two. Had the *Chaldee paraphrast* thought, that *Moses* by the spirit of God, had written both these divers readings, (as you say he did) then it had bene sacriledge in him to have suppressed and kept back one of them from vs. This vve see also in the *Arabique version*, which though it sometimes translate according to the readings vvhich the Masorites have set in the margine, as in 1 *Sam.* 2.3. and sometimes according to the reading which is set vvithin the line of the

text, as in *Pſal.* 100. 3, &c. yet ſtill it hath but one reading, and muſt therfore be guilty of perfidie and treachery againſt the holy Ghoſt, if it had acknowledged two readings appoynted of God. The like is to be obſerved alſo in the *Perſian Thargum*, which ſtill followes not a double reading, but keepes to one onely, as in *gardan o*, *Gen.* 33. 3, & *peraſane o*, *Deut.* 33. 9, & ſo in other places. And this alſo is that vvhich is commonly practiſed in other vulgar tranſlations vſed in the Churches of Chriſt this day, who are therfore vvitneſſes againſt you in this matter, vnleſs they vvill condemne themſelves of vnfaithfulnes in keeping the ſcriptures.

Secondly, though the *Chaldee verſion* do ſometimes follow that reading vvhich now ſtands in the margine: yet vvho can affirme that it ſtood in the margine of that copie which this paraphraſt then vſed, rather then in the text itſelf? The Maſorites though coming after the *Chaldee paraphraſt* might finde divers copies of the ſcripture, differing one from an other: from theſe might they gather the divers readings, and ſo write ſome of them in the text, and ſome of them in the margine: even as many Printers of late, having gathered and noted *divers readings* from ſuch as vvere ancienter then themſelves, do now adde them to the margine of the new Teſtament. And therfore that vvhich you call an *evident proofe* of the Maſorites not adding them; is no proofe at all. It is one thing to invent or deviſe divers reading; an other, to gather, compile and adde them to the ſcriptures.

Thirdly, ſuppoſe the *Chaldee verſiõs* had followed & mainteyned both the divers readings, & that they had placed thē partly in the text & partly in the margine: yet is not their authoritie ſo great, that we might therevpõ ſay with you, that *Moſes* did by the ſpīrit of God write both. Theſe *Chaldee paraphraſts* in their verſions do inſert many fabulous things, & oftē go aſtray in moſt groſſe maner: ſo that ſuch vveighty poynts are not to be built vpon their credit. The [x] firſt and ancienteſt of them, and freer frō errour then the reſt, tranſlates the vvords of *Lamech* quite contrary

[x] Onkelos Targum on Gen. 4. 23.

trary to the text: whereas the ſcripture makes *Lamech* to ſay, *I have killed or would kill a man, &c.* this paraphraſt makes him to ſay, *I have not killed a man*: This his errour is [y] acknowledged by yourſelf: and herein I do agree with you, for how ſoever [z] *Iunius* ſayth, that the vvords in the Chaldee paraphraſt are to be read interrogatively, *have I not killed?* that is, *I have*: according to the meaning of the Hebrew text: yet ſeing the other words of the paraphraſt which follow immediately in that place do not ſo fitly agree with ſuch an interrogation: I do therfore take the paraphraſt his meaning to be accordtng to the Rabbinical expoſition of that ſtory, vvhich I noted [a] before; viz. that he had not killed a man, preſumptuouſly but by errour not ſo *that I ſhould beare ſin for him, or that my ſeed ſhould be conſumed for him*: for ſo the paraphraſt explanes his meaning, and ſo *R. Solomon* [b] would have *Lamechs* meaning to be: though the ſcripture ſeemes to teach an other thing. Againe this paraphraſt tranſlating the ſtory of the well which the Princes of Iſrael digged, doth quite pervert the text, and turnes it into a fable, and ſaith that this [c] *Well being given vnto them from the wildernes, went with them downe into the vallies, and aſcended with them vp vnto the hilles and high places*, and followed them ſtill, &c. VVhereas it is ſayd in the bleſſing of *Gad*, that *there was a portion of the law giver hid*: this he turnes into an other fable, and ſaith, that [d] *Moſes the great ſcribe of Iſrael was buried in the inheritance of Gad*, vvhich is directly contrary vnto the ſcripture, vvhich ſhewes that *Moſes* was [e] buryed in the land of *Moab*, a place which none of the tribes poſſeſſed: and the tribe of *Reuben* was alſo ſituate betwixt this place and the tribe of *Gad*. From this paraphraſt do other of the [f] Rabbines borow this fiction alſo. And a number of other errours and falſe tranſlations might be ſhewed in him. As for the other Chaldee Paraphraſt, *R. Ionathan ben vzziel* whom the Iewes do ſo highly extoll, he is yet more full of errours: They ſay of him, that [g] *in the houre that he vſed to ſit and ſtudy the law, every bird that flew over him was preſently burnt*: And the gloſſe thereon doth give this reaſon,

[y] Annot. on Gen. Ibid.

[z] Animadv. contra Bellar. de verbo dei, lib. 2. Cap. 3.

[a] Pag. 348, 349.

[b] Comment. on Gen. 4. 23

[c] Onkelos Targum on Numb. 21. 18. 19, 20.

[d] Onkelos Targum on Deut. 33 21.

[e] Deut. 34. 6.

[f] Raſi on Deut. 33. 21.

[g] Thalmud in Succa. c. 2. Fol. 28. A

reason, that the vvordes of the law did then reioyce, as vvhen they were given at *Sinai*, vvhere the law vvas given with fire. And to make the matter the more credible, there are brought
t Ex mish-pat, ibidem the like examples of *R. Eliezer, and* R. *Iehoshua* compassed vvith
Ibidem. flames of fire round about them. The other t glosse vpon the Thalmud, giving a reason why the birds were burnt, saith that the ministring Angelles were about him, and gathered themselves vnto him to heare the words of the law from his mouth. These vvords of the paraphrast his mouth are such, that even the fabulous Papists themselves, do justly reiect many of them: & therfore some of these instances which I bring, are not to be found in the King of *Spaine* his great Bible printed by *Plantine*, but in the Masorites Bible: This I thought good to advertise the reader of, least any should be deceyved in seeking them there, vvhere they are left out and omitted. Touching the
k R. Ionathan ben vzziel Targum on Iudg. 5. 8. army of *Sisera*, this paraphrast saith, k that he came vp vvith 40000. heads or cheeftaines of his campe: vvith 50000. men armed vvith svvords: vvith 60000. armed vvith speares: vvith
1 On vers. 5 70000. armed vvith targets: vvith 80000. shooters of stones or
2. bolts: beside the 900. charets of yrõ, &c. And there he telles vs of commotion & contention betvvixt the mountaines, *Tabor, Hermon, & Carmel* ech of them persvvading themselves that the Majestie of God should abide vpon them and be revealed vnto them: and how mount *Sinai* being a litle and weak mountaine the glory of God vvas revealed vpon it, &c. Vpon
m Targum on 1. Sam. 2. 1. 2, &c. the song of *Hannah* he saith, m that she was endued with the spirit of prophecie, and how in particular she prophecied of her Sonne *Samuel* and divers wonders to be wrought by him: of *Heman* her Sonnes son who with his 14. Sonnes should sing praise with violes and harpes in the sanctuary of the Lord: of *Sennacherib*, of *Nebuchadnezzar*: of the Kingdome of *Graecia*; of
a Targum on 1. Sam. 17. 8. the sonnes of *Haman*; *of Roome*, &c. Touching *Goliath* the giant of *Gath* he n bringeth divers fictions, how it should be he
n Targ. on 1. Kin. 4. 33. that slew the two sonnes of Eli, that tooke the arke, &c. Touching *Solomon*, he o feigneth, that he prophecied of the kings of the

the house of David, vvhich should beare rule in this vvord and in the vvorld to come, (the world) of the Messias. Touching the army of *Sennacherib*, he saith, that p he brought with him
p Targum on Esay, 10 34. fortie thousand *guspanin* or charets or coaches of gold for the Princes clothed with robes to sit in: that he brought with him two hundred thousand armed with swords and speares: and two hundred and sixtie thousand shooters of stones: and an hundred thousand valiant man to run before him: that the length of his campe vvas foure hundred miles: that his horse-quarter vvas fortie miles: that the number of his hoste vvas two hundred and sixtie thousand millions vvanting one: that so they came vp against *Abraham* when they cast him into the middes of the fiery furnace: and that so they shall come vp when *Gog* and *Magog* come, &c. Touching the vision of the 4 creatures shewed vnto *Ezekiel*, vvhereas the scripture mentioneth onely foure faces, which ech of these creatures had: this
q Targum on Ezek. 1. 6. *Chaldee paraphrast* q addes further that ech of them had *sixteen faces*, and that so the number of faces vnto these 4. creatures were in all *sixtie foure faces*: VVhereas the scripture mentions onely *foure wings* vnto ech creature, this paraphrast addes further by a strange kinde of reckoning, that there were *sixteen wings* to every one of the faces: & that the number of the wings of the foure creatures were *two hundred fiftie & six wings*, &c. And in many other places doth this paraphrast pervert the prophecies concerning Christ, and misinterpret the scriptures quite besides the meaning of the holy spirit. VVhen this paraphrast had thus translated the first and latter Prophets, the
r Thalmud in Megillah Cap. 1. Iewes say r that there vvas an earthquake, and that the earth vvas mooved for the space of 400. miles: that there came a voyce, (a bath-kol) saying, *Who is this that reveales my secret to the sonnes of men?* And after that an other voyce, *Let it suffice thee*: it is enough, and they give the reason why this *Ionathan* might proceed no further in his paraphrase vvith the other bookes of the old testament, least he should reveale *the time of Messias* his coming noted in Daniel: But after him rises vp

a third chaldee paraphraſt, *R. Ioſeph the blinde*, as he is commonly called, even that blinde guide vvhom you do ſo often and ſo abundantly alledge in your annotations on the pſalmes. And this paraphraſt is full of Thalmudique fables, and wreſteth and profaneth the holy ſcriptures to confirme thoſe fables: as for example, the [f] fable of *Behemoth* before noted, vvhich dayly deuoures the graſſe of a thouſand mountaines: the [t] fable of *Tarnegol*, the vvilde cock vvhoſe feet reſt vpon the earth, and his head toucheth the heaven, and there crowes or ſings before God: the [u] fable of that fat *Oxe* which *Adam* offred having hornes before hooſes: the [w] fable of *Leviathan* reſerved for the ſport and play at the banket of the righteous at the coming of Meſſias: In *Pſal.* 57. 3. this paraphraſt ſaith that God commanded a *ſpider* to make a vveb in the mouth of the cave for Davids defence. In *pſ.* 78. 49. he addes vnto the text, that God lay *two hundred & fifty ſtrokes vpon thē in his great anger, by the hand of wicked devilles*. In *Pſ.* 137. 4. he ſaith that the Levites bit of their thumbes with their teeth, when thoſe that led them captives required ſongs of them. And the whole pſalme is turned into a dialogue: and the words of the pſalme are attributed to five ſorts of perſons: ſome to the *Babylonians*; ſome to the *Iewes*, ſome to a *voyce* of the holy Ghoſt: ſome to the Angel *Gabriel* called the Prince of Ieruſalem: ſome to the Angel *Micael* called there the Prince of Sion. And *Micael* is ſayd to pray againſt Edom: and *Gabriel* is feyned to pronounce a bleſſing vpon thē that deſtroy the Babylonians. Touching *Iob* he feigneth that his [x] ſubſtance was far greater then the text ſheweth: he putteth [y] *Lilith queene of Zemargad* for the *ſhabeans*: he [z] feigneth *Dinah* to be the wife of *Iob*: he telles a miraculous wonder touching the three frends of *Iob*, noted before. He alludes vnto the [a] fables of the cock: and a number of other fictions he hath in that book. As for the paraphraſe on *Eſter*, it is full of vaine and preſumptuous fictions: as, that [b] a decree was made concerning *Vaſhti* that ſhe ſhould be ſlaine naked, becauſe of her counſaile to hinder the building of the temple: that King *Aha-*

[f] R. Ioſeph Cæcus, Targum on Pſ. 50. 10.
[t] Ibid. on verſ. 11.
[u] On Pſ. 69 31.
[w] On Pſal. 104. 26.
[x] Targum on Iob. 1. 3
[y] On v. 15.
[z] On Iob. 2 9.
[a] On Iob. 3 7. & 38. 36 & 39. 16.
[b] Targum on Eſter. 1.

Ahaſuerus ſought to ſit on the throne of *Solomon* which was brought from Ieruſalem by *Sheſhak* King of Egipt; and from thence was taken by *Sennacherib*: and from thence returned to Ieruſalem in the dayes of *Hezekias*: & from thence was brought againe to Egipt by *Pharaoh*: and from thence to Babel by *Nebuchadnezar*: and from thence to *Elam* by *Cyrus*: and that now *Ahaſuerus* ſought to ſit vpon this throne, but could not: that he ſent for workmen from Alexandria to make an other like vnto this, and that they could not: but made an other worſe then it in two yeares ſpace, and that in the third yeare *Ahaſuerus* did ſit vpon it: that with the *ſix hundred & foureſcore* braſen Cheſts full of gold and pearle found by Cyrus in a haven of Euphrates he made that feaſt for *a hundred and foureſcore* dayes: that in his ſecond feaſt he appoynted them to drinke in the golden Veſſels of the ſanctuary brought from Ieruſalem by the wicked *Nebuchadnezzar*, and that the other veſſels of the King did change their ſhape before the veſſels of the ſanctuarie: that *Mordecai* abſteyned from that feaſt and prayed & faſted vntill the ſeventh day; that the King ſent for *Vaſhti* to come naked before the people to ſhew her beauty: that this was, becauſe ſhe had made the daughters of Iſrael naked, and ſo to carde wool & flax vpon the Sabath day: and a multitude of ſuch like preſumptions and pervertings of the holy text are there to be ſeene throughout that whole ſtory from the beginning to the end thereof. In *Ruth* likewiſe the *Chaldee paraphraſt* telleth vs of ten famines: of which [c] one was in the dayes of *Adam*, an other in the dayes of *Lamech*, &c. he ſaith that *Ruth* was the daughter *Eglō* King of Moab: that *Boaz* [d] ſayd vnto her at the firſt finding of her in his field, that it was told him by prophecie that Kings & Prophets ſhould come of her: that whē Boaz meaſured vnto her [e] *ſix* meaſures of barley, ſhe obteyning ſtrēgth from God to cary the ſame, did then forthwith prophecie that *ſix* righteous perſons ſhould proceed from her, whereof every one ſhould be bleſſed with *ſix* bleſſings, to wit, *David, Daniel, and his companions, and the King Meſſias*: And [f] other of the Rabbines ſay, that

[c] Targum on Ruth, 1.
[d] On Ruth 2.
[e] One, 3. 15.
[f] Iſaak ben Arama on Ruth, 3. 15

thoſe *ſix* bleſſings were the gift of the ſpirit mentioned with *ſix* names or attributes in *Eſay.* 11.2. But they differ about the perſons, ſome reckoning *Hezekias and Ioſias* among thoſe ſix. Sundry other ſuch things doth this paraphraſt there record. In the paraphraſe vpon the *Lamentations* it is ſayd, that g vvhen the wicked *Nebuchadnezzar* ſaw ſome of the captived Princes of the Children of Iſrael, to go empty without burden, he commanded them to ſow the bookes of the law together, to make ſackes of them, to fill them with gravell from the ſhore of *Euphrates*, and then to lay them vpon their neckes; that then there was no reſt vnto their eyes. As for the Chaldee paraphraſe on the *Canticles* ſo often alledged by you, it is all over in every Chapter repleniſhed with Thalmudique fictions: And vvhat vvorth is there then in theſe witneſſes, if they had given teſtimonie vnto thoſe divers readings that you maintaine? If their tranſlations according to the margine or line be of authority, you may thereby bring the Rabbinicall fables into the text and prove them to be divine ſcripture, written by the ſpirit of God, as wel as you may juſtify *lo, not*; *and lo, to himſelf*.

g Targum on Lam. 5. 5.

// Annot. on Exo. 21. 8.

YOu adde yet further in the // ſame place: that *the Greek copies vvhere varie, ſome having*, hath betrothed her to him, *other ſome*, hath not betrothed: *and ſo Theodotio and Symmachus alſo tranſlated*, hath not betrothed. Anſwer.

1. Howſoever they tranſlate this place in the Greek with much varietie; yet this is to be obſerved that none of the ſeverall tranſlations do commend vnto vs a double reading, as your tranſlation doth: ech of them ſhewes vnto vs but one onely reading: and therfore the example of every one of them teſtifyeth againſt you. Had the Greek tranſlatours imagined that the double readings vvere a divine tradition delivered vnto Moſes at mount *Sinai*, it had bene great impiety in them to have ſuppreſſed the ſame. This had bene to have clipped the Lords coyne by paring away ſo many parts of his holy word.

2: As for theſe Greek tranſlations of the old Teſtament, had they bene more direct for your purpoſe, yet ſhould their teſtimonie have litle holpen you in this matter; Their credit is very ſmall, in reſpect of the innumerable errours, falſifications and corruptions of the holy text whereof they are moſt apparantly guilty. You ſay indeed touching the Greek and Chaldee verſions, that they are, "*both, of great authoritie, eſpecially the Greek, honoured even by the Apoſtles in their ſo often following not onely the vvords but even the theologicall expoſition.*" And for the declaration of this, you produce divers examples, comparing the Greek verſion with the new Teſtament in *Eſa. 11. 10 with Rom. 15. 12. In Prov. 3. 34. with Iam. 4. 6. In Prov. 11. 31, with 1 Pet. 4. 18. In Eſa 42. 4. with Mat. 12. 21.* with ſundry others And els where alſo you "write to theſame purpoſe. I anſwer.

" Preface to annot. on Gen.

" Preface to annot. on Pſalmes

Firſt, for the tranſlation of the 72. interpreters the dayes of *Ptolomæus Philadelphus*: it is vncertaine whether they tranſlated any more then the five bookes of *Moſes*: for the teſtimony of ancient writers varieth much about this matter: And *Ioſephus* witneſſeth, that *Ptolemee* had not the whole ſcripture, but the ·/· *law onely* from theſe interpreters: and alledgeth this as a reaſon, why he vndertook a more full declaration of the ſervves ſtory. And this reaſon of his, is againſt their opinion alſo, vvho imagine that the reſt of the ſcriptures were tranſlated by other 72. interpreters in the dayes of *Herod* and the laſt *Ptolemee* for if the whole ſtorie of the old Teſtament had bene by ſuch a famous tranſlation of other *Septuagints* turned into Greek & publiſhed vnto the world, then could not *Ioſephus* have alledged this reaſon as a ſpeciall cauſe of his enterpriſe. And then if this teſtimonie of *Ioſephus* be true, the moſt of thoſe inſtances which in both your forenamed prefaces you bring to countenance this tranſlation of the *Septuagint* as being approved in the new Teſtament, are quite beſide the matter; becauſe the moſt of theſe your inſtances are taken not from the law, but from other parts of ſcripture, vvhich according to the teſtimony of *Ioſephus* were not tranſlated by the ſeptuagint.

·/· Antiq. Iud. proæm. lib. 1. c. 1.

Secondly, the tranſlation of the ſeptuagint whether it was of the law onely, or of the whole ſcripture of the old Teſtament,

is much to be ſuſpected as an vnfaithfullll and maimed work even from the firſt beginning thereof: ſeing divers // vvitneſſes do record vnto vs of them, that they did purpoſely adde, alter detract and change many things in their Greek tranſlation otherwiſe then they were in the originall Hebrew text. The honour that many give vnto theſe interpreters is far too great, " affirming even their aberrations and contrarieties to the text, to be written by the direction of a divine and propheticall ſpirit: and tell vs alſo of " miraculous things touching this tranſlation, and this both with contradiction to themſelves and apparant contrariety to the truth.

// Hieron. prefat. in Pētateuch.

" Auguſt. de civitate Dei lib. 18. Cap. 43.

" Epiphan. de menſuris & ponderibus.

The Iewes them ſelves confeſſe that this tranſlation of the law hath bene a burden vpon their conſciences; for which they do repent vnto this day. *R. Iaakob* deſcribing the divers faſts which they obſerve, ech moneth in the yeare, ſaith that they faſt a *in the eight day of the moneth Tebeth, becauſe then the law was written in Greek in the dayes of king* Ptolæmeus: *and that there was darknes in the world for three dayes*. This their practiſe is ſutable to their auncient envy againſt the gentiles, 1. *Theſſ.* 2. 16. *Act.* 22. 21, 22. And being ſo affected, it is the leſſe marvell, if they ſought to hide or change divers things in their tranſlation.

a Arba Turim, lib. Orach chajim. in inTaanith, or treat. of faſting, fig. 580.

Thirdly, that auncient tranſlation of the ſeptuagints doth not appeare at this day. Some think we have onely ſome fragments thereof: and others think it to be quite loſt. Touching theſe opinions, *D. Whitaker* b ſaith *Verior illorum ſententia videtur, qui verſionem illam omnino periſſe exiſtimant*. He approves their iudgement moſt, that hold it altogether loſt. And againe in the ſame place, after many corruptions noted in it, he ſaith we may thence conclude that either we have not this tranſlation of the 70 elders; or els that it is ſo infinitely and filthily corrupted, that it is now of very ſmall authoritie.

b De ſacra ſcriptura. contr. 1. quæſt. 2. Cap. 3.

Fourthly, as for that Greek tranſlation which is extant at this day, going vnder the name of the ſeptuagint, & which you honour ſo much and alledge ſo often, it appeares evidently to be a moſt corrupt thing, full of forgeries, and ſwarming with errours

rours over all from the beginning to the end of it. All good writers at this day do generally vpon occaſion vvitneſſe ſo much. In ſpeciall there is one " learned man who hath taken paines to ſet downe ſome generall heads & as it were ſtanderds vnder which thoſe troopes and legions of errour and falſifications might be in ſome part reduced and and marſhalled. Divers examples he ſhewes of ſeverall kindes, and yet vnto ech kinde more inſtances might be added: yea and more generall heads of ſuch errours be deſcribed alſo. Many witneſſe that it was corrupt of old: but for this time preſent, the corruptions are vnſpeakable and without number: and more alſo then the corruptions of *Onkelos and Ionathan* the Chaldee paraphraſts, & therfore alſo of leſſe authoritie though you in your compariſon affirme the contrary.

" Engelbertus Engels in proæm. pentaglott. vat. Schund.

Fifthly, as the errours of this Greek tranſlation are for number many: ſo are they for the nature of thē very great. Some of them do directly contradict the text as in *Pſ.* 105. 28. *Gen.* 26. 32. in the firſt place affirming what the ſcripture denyes, & in the later denying that which God affirmes in his word. They impugne the truth of the holy ſtory, in deſcribing the yeares of ſundry patriarkes, eſpecially by giving ſo many yeares vnto Methuſchelah as if he had lived 14. yeares after the flood, *Gen.* 5. In ſtead of 40, they put 3 dayes, *Ion.* 3. That moſt abſurd fable of the Iewes touching the play with Leviathā is countenāced by this tranſlatiō of the ſeptuagint *Pſ.* 104. 26. The moſt impious errour of the Arians denying the eternall godhead of Chriſt, doth alſo receive ſtrength from this corrupt verſion, whiles they tranſlate *Prov.* 8. 22. *he hath created me in the beginning of his wayes:* in ſtead of *he hath poſſeſſed me*, as though Chriſt were but a mere creature. In reſpect of theſe forgeries, it is moſt vntrue which you ſay, of this Greek tranſlation, with the Chaldee: that they are *both, of great authoritie*. The Chaldee Paraphraſt tranſlateth that place of the Proverbs as the Greek hath it.

Sixthly, whereas you ſay, that *the Apoſtles do ſo often follow not onely the words, but even the Theologicall expoſition* of theſe interpreters;

preters; this is also an vncertaine and vnwarrantable assertion: for all the examples that you alledge who is it that cā certainely prove vnto vs that the Apostles followed the septuagint & that those corrupted Greek versions of the old Testament were not rather corrected according to the allegations of the Apostles in the new; Seing this translation is generally supposed to be a patchery out of many; what hinders but that the correctours of the septuagint, in later editions, might follow the words of the Apostles, & that so by this meanes, that agreement of expositions words and phrases which is betwixt them in some place might arise.

Sevently, suppose the Apostles in their Greek writings did vse the version of the septuagint, in some allegations as being then best knowne there being few or none other translations at that time, it doth not follow hence that it should therfore be honoured above others in these times, when as there is not the like occasion of writing in Greek; when as there are many other translations extant more fit for vse, and far freer from corruption.

Eighthly, as for the translations of *Symmachus & Theodotio*, they being both of them heretiques and enimies of Christe, and one of them also an Apostate from Christianity to Indaisme, yea & since that time also their translations being exceedingly corrupted, it skilles not much, whether they margine or the line, or both be followed and observed in the fragments of their Greek versions. Their credit is far too weake to procure divine authoritie vnto both the divers readings which are in the Masorites Bible, yea though they had plainely avouched the same, which yet is not shewed out of them: even by your owne instance of their translation, they followed but one reading onely, and therfore their example, if it be ought worth, is against your self, who deliver two vnto vs, and those both as from the Lord.

y. Annot. on Gē. 23. 2 & 33. 4. & on 34. 35, &c.

ANother spice of this transgression is, that *you propound vnto vs for grounds of instruction, to be observed & meditated

ditated vpon, such traditions of the Masorites as are not manifested to be from God, no more then those divers readings before spoken of: as namely the great and litle letters in the mides of words and sentences; the extraordinary prickes that are set over some words, &c. Touching these we may observe;

First, that they have no other ground then the Kabala or tradition of the Masorites: These and other such like traditions they hold to be the strength of the law and of divine warrant, and commended vnto vs by the holy Ghost: *Elias Levita* in his explication of the masora or tradition sings on this maner: *ij vahalo hammasorah, hi sig lethorah*: *Is not the masora, the hedge of the law?* And to this purpose after his owne song, he alledgeth the song of songs, *Cant.* 3. 7. 8. with the opinion of the Rabbines, touching those 60. strong men which are round about *Solomons bed*, the valiant men of Israel, all handling the sword, expert in warre, every one having his sword vpon his thigh for the feare by night: *these* saith he *are the tradition or masoreth, and their signes, least the law should be forgotten in the captivity. R. Solomon* in his commentaries on the same scripture teacheth the same. But note the vncertainty & vanitie of thē, evē from their owne vaine and perverted expositions: The *Chaldee paraphrase* vpon the same place expounderh those 60. strong men, to be the Priests spreading out their hands, standing vpon their pulpits, & blessing the people, the house of Israel with *the 60. letters* delivered vnto *Moses* their master, &c. By those 60. letters (as I take it) they meane that forme of blessing prescribed, *Numb.* 6. 24. 25. 26. for by the reckoning I finde that in it there are just 60. letters, conteyned in those 3. verses. *Aben Ezra* in his comment on Cant. 3. expounds those 60. strong men to be the 60. myriads or six hundred thousand that entred into the Land.

*Masoreth ham masoreth, in his rythmical preface

*Ibid. profat. tertia

Secondly, whereas on *Gen.* 33. 4. you say. *Therfore the Word* kysſed *is extraordinarily noted in the Hebrew With three pricks over it, as leading the reader to observe well this matter*: let vs see what extraordinary mysteries your Iew doctours will teach vs from

hence: It is "shewed vs out of their records thus, *Rabbi Ianna sayd the pricking doth shew that Esau sought not* a *to kysse Iaakob, but* b *to bite him: and his neck became marble, so that the teeth of that Wicked one were set on edge. Therfore also it followeth, And they wept to wit, one for his neck, th'other for his teeth. R. Solomon* in his commentaries on that place notes further the difference of the Rabbines touching this matter.

" Ioan. Buxt. Thesaur gram. Cap. 5. ex Ialkut.
a Lenasscheko.
b Lenasschecho.

Thirdly, whereas vpon the word *harlot* in *Gen.*34,31, you say: *In the Hebrewe* Zonah, *the first letter is extraordinarily great, for some hidden meaning, What if it be, to signify the stout and big Words of these yong men to their father? So a litle letter is vsed before in* Gen. 23.2. *to signify moderation Without excesse in Abrahams weeping.* Your coniecture for *Zonah* hath some colour, though a trifling vanity and without ground, but your assertion to countenance the same from the litle letter in *Gen.23.* to signify moderation is a very vnreasonable and absurd speculation. For what colour of reason is there, that a moderate sorow should be signifyed by an immoderately litle letter; that an ordinate affection should be represented by an inordinate extraordinary token? if the big letter in *Zonah* note the fault of the exceeding stout and big words in the yong men to their father: why should not the letter in *BAcAH, WFpTE*, wanting the due proportion and measure with the rest, as wel note a defect and fault of the too litle sorow in Abraham? The comparing of these two examples so vnequally opposed and mismatched togather doth justly reprove and refute your collection from the same.

c Pag. 46

Fourthly, whereas you pleaded e before, that the separation of *Mr. Cluse* your elder from the French church, was lawfull, because of their *preaching from humane apocryphal catechismes*; even by the like reason may you see that your ministery also is to be forsaken and left, if you preach in your congregation, and expound the scriptures in such maner as you do here. For what are these exttraordinary prickes, that you speak of: these formes of great and litle letters in the middes of words and sentences, but

but humane apocryphall devises of Rabbines and Thalmudiques? what divine warrant have you for them, and for your expounding of them and of *Keri* & *cethib*, both togather in one place? It is ten times more lawfull to expound the principles of Christian religion in Catechismes according to the maner of the French Churches, then to expound these Iewish fables and toyes in such maner as you do. These Iewish devises are d expressely condemned by the holy Ghost: th'other not so.

d Tit. 1. 14.

Fiftly, if the Lord by the finger of his spirit do direct vs to take speciall observatiō of those extraordinary prickes that you tell vs of in *Gen.33.4.* to the end that we might search out some hidden meaning therein: then are you againe guilty of great perfidie and vnfaithfullnes, which in your translation and annotations also in other places do passe them over and conceale those parts of the scripture, where divine vvarnings or meditation are propounded vnto vs. For whereas there are fifteene words noted by the scribes and by some printers to have such prickes over their heads: five of them are by you already wrapt vp in darknes and passed over in silence, namely in *Gen.* 16.5. & 18.9. and 19.33, and 37.12. & *Psal.* 27.13. In each of these places, are these prickes to be seene, vvhich you omit without giving any vvarning of them. So do you also passe by the litle letter in " *behibbaream*: the great letter in ° *Cainah*, and the suspended letter lifted vp in the word *jagnar*, &c. These being of like regard by the tradition of the Masorites, ought in like maner to have bene noted by you: and suppose you could not have shewed the reason of them in these places, yet should you at least have given warning of them vnto your readers and have left them to their consideration. In like maner do you also passe by the *crownes* of the speciall letters which are so oft noted therewith in the lavv, of vvhich it is savd by *R. Iudah*, that " *Moses on a certaine time ascending on high, he found the holy blessed God binding crownes vpon the letters*; to vvit, three for each of the seven letters conteyned in the vvord *schagnatnazgats*, as was noted " before. In the same place of the Thalmud it is recor-

" Ambr. on Gen. 24
° Ambr. on Psal. 80. 13. & vers. 15.
" Thalmud in Menachoth cap. 3. Fol. 29.
" Pag. 254

ded how the Lord foretold vnto *Moſes*, that after certaine generatiõs there ſhould come a man evẽ *Akibah bẽ Ioſeph* by name, who ſhould expound vnto vs all thoſe crownes, prickes and titles of the letters: that the Lord alſo at *Moſes* requeſt did ſhew that man vnto him: and that *Moſes* in admiration of him did ſay, *O Lord of the world haſt thou ſuch a man as this, and doſt thou deliver thy law by mine hand?* &c. Now *R. Akiba* being come: and you being ſo familiar with theſe Talmudiſts, is it not wonder that you have nothing to ſay for our inſtruction, touching theſe crownes and miters, eſpecially there being the ſame Talmudique warrant to prove that they are divine, holy & from God, as there is to prove *Keri* and *cethib*, the divers readings to be both written by the ſpirit of God? VVhen the Lord ſhewed the patterne of the tabernacle and inſtruments thereof vnto *Moſes*, he commanded him to make e limbes or crownes of gold for the arke, the table and altar of incenſe: & it had bene great vnfaithfulnes in *Moſes* to have neglected the ſame. Now the frame of the holy ſcriptures is as precious and excellent as was the forme of the tabernacle: if therfore thoſe prickes over ſpeciall wordes belong vnto them of right as their crownes, then is your vnfaithfulnes in the houſe of God, great in your omitting of them.

e Exod. 25 31. 24. 25. & 30. 3.

And as for the Iew doctours, they plot with theſe prickes a Crovvne of thornes for the head of the Lord directly contrary vnto the letter and ſenſe of the ſcripture: as in *Gen. 19. 33* where it is ſayd of *Lot* touching his eldeſt daughter, that he perceyved not, neither when ſhe lay downe, nor *when ſhe roſe vp*: becauſe of the prick that crowneth the vvord *roſe*, ·׳· they gather and teach that though he perceyved her not when ſhe lay downe, yet he perceyved her when ſhe roſe vp. VVhere it is ſayd in *Gen.* 37. 12. they went to feed *the flock*, &c. becauſe of the prick over the word *the*, R. *Solomon* "gathers that they went not but to feed themſelves. In *Numb.* 3. 39. becauſe of the crowne of prickes over the word *Aaron*, R. Sol. gathers that *Aaron* was not in the number of the Levites. In *Deut.* 29. 29. be-

f Thalmud de nazir. cap. 4. P. 23.

"Commét. on theſe places.

becauſe of the prickes over the words, *to vs and to our Children* the ſame Rabbine teacheth that Iſrael was not vrged to do the things revealed vntill they had paſſed over *Iorden* & taken vpon them the oth in mount *Gerizim*, &c.

ANother curioſitie of much like nature with the former is, when according to the maner of the Cabaliſts, you draw obſervations to illuſtrate your doctrine from the tranſpoſed letters of the ſcripture. As for example concerning *Er* and *Noah* you "ſay thus: *The letters in Hebrue of this Word* evil, *and of his name* Er, *are the ſame, the order onely changed: the like Where-of is before in Noes name and Grace, Gen. 6. 8.* Ianſwer, 1. The letters of the ſcriptnre being thus tranſpoſed by men, are no ſcripture nor ground of inſtruction; if the order be onely changed, it is enough to change the whole ſenſe: if accidentally it come to paſſe in one or two wordes, that there is an agreement of ſenſe, yet in hundreds it falles out otherwiſe: and therfore there is no ſound collections or annotations to be made from ſuch a forged order of tranſpoſed letters. 2, though the Hebrue letters that ſignify *Evil*, be the ſame with *Er* his name, yet the vowells differ, and they alſo make the ſignification differẽt: 3, ſutable vnto this curioſitie, is that preſumptuous aſſertion which in your annotations on the ſame verſe you make by occaſion of this *Er* and his evill, in that you ſay, *as our Lord Chriſte Was to come of* Iudas, *Heb. 7. 14. ſo God Would have no Wicked man to be his progenitour.* For where hath God revealed this vnto you, which you do ſo peremptorily affirme? or why do you preſume above that which is written? The ſonne of God hath abaſed himſelf for vs in wonderfull maner, and in many degrees; in that he was made man; ſuppoſe man had bene without ſin: in that he took vpon him our nature, evẽ after the fall, after that our nature was abaſed and diſhonoured with ſin: in that he refuſed not to come of ſuch parents, as vvere ſtayned with notorious adulteries, as *David* & *Bathſheba:* in that he refuſed not to diſcend vnto vs through the loynes & vvombe of inceſtuous parents, and even at the act of inceſt, at the ſame

" Annot. on Gẽ. 38.

time and instant, as in *Iudah* & *Thamar* begetting *Pharez*: in that he came of vvicked parents before their effectuall conversion, as ¶ of *Terah* begetting *Abram*, before God called him. And further, how know you that none of Christes progenitours frō *Arpacshad* to *Terah*, from *Nathan* to *Salathiel*: from *Salathiel* to *Iesus* in so many generations, were vvicked men? vvhy dare you speak so boldly, where the scripture is silent? As it is sin to remoove the ancient bounds, so is it also a sinfull presumption to set downe such bounds and limits of Christs humiliation as God hath not described vnto vs in his vvord. Besides, is there not as much reason to say that God would have no vvicked vvoman from *Evah* to *Marie* to be the mother of Christe, as that no wicked man should be his progenitour? And if this may be affirmed in honour of Christs kinred, why may it not as wel be extended vnto others that were in the same loynes with him: and where shall the stay be? if modestie and sobrietie stay vs not, there wilbe no end of forging and presuming above the scriptures.

/ Iosh. 24 2. with Gen. 11. with Gen. 12.

OF this sort also is that kinde of observation which you commend vnto vs when as you note the word *sleep*, to signify, *quiet sleep without cark and sorow*: And for proofe to confirme the same, you adde: a *Therfore also the Hebrue word* Shena *is written with* ה, *a quiet dumm letter*, (*otherwise then vsual*) *to denote the more quietnes*. Answ. 1. The *Masorites* indeed both in *Masora magna*, *& parva* do set their marke vpon this word, for a memoriall of their tradition concerning the same: *Elias Levita* also in his explication of the Masora doth b mention this word *Shena*, but he doth withall in the same place note many other words of like nature and observatiō, viz. 22 words wherin *Aleph* is quiescent or deficient in the middes or in the end of them: and 17 others which they call *maphkin Aleph*: All these vary from the common and vsuall maner; and do yeeld the like ground and warrant for instructions to be gathered from them, as doth the word *Shena* in *Psal. 127. 2.* Yea and not these onely, but all the other formes of words, full, defective, chan-

a Annot. on Psal. 127. 2.

b Masoreth hammasoreth in Tabulis primis: Orat. 9.

changed, &c. which he hath noted in that treatise. *Elias Levita* there alluding to the tables of the law, in his first tables hath 10 words or sections: and in his second tables 10. other sections describing those words from whence the Masoriticall mysteries are collected. And if any sound collections are to be drawne from such grounds then are you to blame which passe by such words without giving your readers any warning thereof: If your annotations on this place, *Ps.* 127. be just, then are they defective in other the like places as in *Ps. 94. 5. Gen. 20. 6*, &c. 2. If some mysterie were to be gathered from *Aleph* in *Shena*, yet how should we be assured, that it doth denote *more quietnes*, as you affirme? if it had bene writtē *Shena* with the letter *hè* in the end according to the vsual maner: you might as well have sayd that *hè* is *a quiet dumm letter*: being quiescēt in the end of a word as wel as *Aleph*. And we see the word *Shenah* without *Aleph* is els where vsed to signify a most quiet sleep: as the c sweet sleep of the labourer: and the d sweet sleep of the Prophets, and the e sweet sleep of the godly. Yea and further the word *Shazah* vsed to expres the sleep of the greatest sleepers, hath in it a double *hè* vvithout any *Aleph*, as most fit to denote vnto vs a strong sleep. Moreover if *Aleph* in *Shenah* be a note of greater quietnes, then why should it not signify the same in other vvords as vvell as in this? And then according to this your collection, if *hè* be a more quiet letter then *Aleph*, the thrones of earthly Princes should be more quiet without cark and sorow, then is the throne of God; because the word g *Cese* vsed ordinarily for their thrones, is written with *Aleph*, the quiet dumme letter, denoting (as you say) more quietnes; whereas the word h *Cesch* whereby the throne of God is described, doth (otherwise then vsual) want the letter *Aleph* and hath *hè* in stead thereof.

c Eccles. 5. 11. d Ierem. 31. 26. e Prov. 3. 24. Esa. 56. 10. g Gen. 41. 40. Iudg. 3. 20. &c. h Iob. 26. 9

MVch like vnto this, is that kinde of instruction, which you vse, when having alledged some scriptures, to prove *by the heavēs & earth in Gē. 1. 1.* are vnderstood, *the world & all things therein: things visible and invisible*: You adde further, that *the* Hebrew

i Annot. on Gē. 1. 1.

brew *articles* eth & ha, *seem also to imply so much* : eth, *having the first and last letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and so being of generall comprehension* : & ha, *of plaine demonstration.* If this kind of teaching were good you might as well say, that when the Prophets Esaias, Amos and Micaiah are sayd to see the Lord in their severall visions; they did see him and all that is in him : because this same article *eth* is prefixed before the name of the Lord in each of their [k] visions; and that it being of such generall comprehension doth imply so much. But seing this is impossible, you shall do well to ceasse from the wisedome of such Cabalisticall collections.

[k] Esay. 6. 1. Amos 9. 1. 2. Kin. 22. 19.

CHAP. V.

A Fift errour is, in that you alledge the words of the Rabbines contrary to their meaning; either not vnderstanding what they meane, or els wilfully perverting that which they say, and this also in matters of greatest weight: This may be seene in many instances.

First, when as you speak of Adam cast out of Eden, & kept from the tree of life, you say; [c] *The ancient Iewes had an expectation of recovery of this losse by Christe, though now they are ignorant of him: for they write of 7 things which the King Christ shall shew unto Israel, two of which are the garden of Eden and the tree of life. R. Elias ben Mosis, in sepher reshith chocmah, fol. 412. Also expounding that in Song 1. 3. the King hath brought me into his Chambers: Our Doctours of blessed memorie, have sayd, that these are the Chambers of the garden of Eden. And againe, there are also that say of the tree of life, that it was not created in vayne, but the men of the resurrection* (that are raysed from the dead) *shall eat thereof, and live for ever R. Menachem on Gen. 3. And by the* garden of Eden (*or paradise*) *it seemes they understood the Kingdome of heaven, for the chalde Paraphrast on Song. 4. 12. saith, as the garden of Eden into which no man hath power to enter, but the iust, whose soules are sent thither, by the hands*

[c] Annot. on Gen. 3. 24.

hands of Angels. I answer.

1. VVhy might you not as well have sayd, that the later Iewes as well as the ancient Iewes, have still an expectation of the recovery of this losse by Christe, namely of the garden of Eden, and of the tree of life, &c. do not the Iewes that now live receive and approve the writings of these Rabbines here alledged by you: how then do you shew any difference betwixt them in this poynt?

2. How can you say by way of opposition, in comparing the later Iewes with the ancient, that *now they are ignorant of Christe*, seing the ancient Iewes were also ignorant of him? The *Chaldee paraphrast* being of cheefest authoritie among all that are here alledged by you, was most ignorant of Christe: he knew not that Christe vvas come, but [f] writes of him as of one that should come hereafter, though by content of all he lived after the death of Christe. And further he vvrites of *two Christes* that are to come: for, expounding those vvords in *Cant.* 4. 5 *vid* 7. 3. *Thy two breasts are as two young roes that are twinnes*, &c. this paraphrast sayth, that these are two Messiasses that are to come, namely *Messias the sonne of David, and Messias the sonne Ephraim.* And many other things he vvrites most ignorantly touching Christe, being a blinde guide vnto the later Iewes that yet are alive to confirme them in their ignorance.

[f] On Cant. 8.

3. Though the Rabbines speaking of the garden of Eden and of the tree of life, do therewithall mention the men of the resurrection and the sending of them thither by the hands of Angels: yet is this no token that they vnderstood hereby *the Kingdome of heaven*: because these blinde Doctours hold and teach that there is a double resurrection, one in which the bodies of men shall be raysed vp to live on earth againe at the coming of Messias: and an other at the last judgement, when they shall be raysed vp to live in the Kingdome of heaven. The *Chaldee paraphrast* expounding those words, [d] *Who is this that commeth vp out of the wildernes*, &c. and alluding to that place in [e] Zechariah, where it is sayd that the mounte of

[d] Cant. 8. 5
[e] Zach. 14. 4.

olives ſhall cleave in the middes, ſhewes that at the coming of
Meſſias (which he mentioned a litle f before) the dead ſhall
f On Cant. 8. 1. ariſe, *the mount of oyntment ſhall be divided, the dead of Iſrael ſhall aſcend from vnder it, alſo the dead that dyed in the captivitie ſhall*
// Orach Cubbala. *come // the thorny way from vnder the earth and ſhall aſcend from vnder the mount of oyntment or of olives.* The meaning is that
thoſe vvhich dyed in Iſrael, in the holy land ſhall riſe againe
with greater eaſe; and thoſe Iewes which now living in diſper-
ſion ſhall dy in other countries muſt not riſe againe in the
lands where they dyed, but muſt have their bodies royled and
tumbled vnder the ground through divers holes and clefts in
the earth vntill they come vnder the mount of olives, and then
that being divided in the middes, they muſt ariſe in that place.
"Comment. on Dan. 12 2. *Aben Ezra* ſhewes " further that thoſe vvhich riſe at the com-
ming of Meſſias ſhall live long time on earth, that their dayes
ſhall be as the dayes of a tree, and then dye the ſecond time &
riſe againe with an other reſurrection afterward. Yea, this
kinde of reſurrection of the body is beleeved and receyved as
an artickle of the Iewes faith, and recorded in their creede, as is
ſhewed at large firſt by *Sebaſt. Munſter* in " that their creed
"Emunath Iehud. p. 46. 47. 53. ·/· Synag. Iudaic. pag. 29, &c. vvhich he publiſhed togather vvith the Hebrew edition of the
goſpell according to *Mathew*: and afterwards by ·/· Buxtorf; at
which reſurrection the Iewes think that they ſhal live on earth
ſo many hundred yeares as the Patriarkes did in the old vvorld
before the flood, before that they dye the ſecond time: and with
all they vvrite of ſo many miracles to be vvrought for them at
that time, as it is no marvel that they do vvithall dreame of
their cariage into an earthly paradiſe by the hands of Angells at
the ſame time.

4. Though the *Chaldee paraphraſt* ſpeak of the juſt entring into the garden of Eden, &c. yet doth it not appeare that he meant the Kingdome of heaven, but the garden vvhere Adam was placed at firſt, even the earthly Eden: ſeing in the ſame booke he ſpeakes of the vſe thereof in divers things: having ſpoken of the beauty of the firſt temple, he ſaith, g *but the houſe of*
g on Cant. 5. 16.

of the ſanctuary to come, which is to be built in the dayes of Meſſias the King, ſhall be much more beautifull in that the walles thereof ſhalbe of the cedars of the garden of Eden. That is the third materiall temple vvhich they expect: and accordingly they expect that the matter thereof ſhalbe not from heaven, but from the earthly Eden. Againe, ſpeaking of the comming of their Meſſias and of the feaſt that is to be made at the ſame time vpō the earth, he ſaith, h *and there we ſhall keep the feaſt with the Leviathan, and we ſhall drink the old red wine, which hath bene layd vp in the grapes from the day that the world was created, and of the pomegranate fruits which are prepared for the iuſt in the garden of Eden.* And after this he ſpeakes of divers things to be done on earth, ſo that it is every way plaine that he intended not an heavenly, but an earthly Paradiſe in theſe places.
h on Cant. S. 2.

5. As for the teſtimony of *R. Menachem*, if vve go no further then the vvords here cited by yourſelf, even by them it is apparant, that he had not a ſpirituall meaning, but ſpoke of that tree from vvhich Adam vvas debarred, and of that tree created in the beginning, vvhich he ſaith *was not created in vaine:* meaning that the men of the reſurrection, of that firſt ſuppoſed and pretended reſurrection ſhould eate thereof.

6. As for the teſtimony of *Elias ben Moſes* in *Reſhith chocmah*, it is ſo vaine & ſuperſtitious a thing that I marvell you vvould alledge the ſame, 1. vvhereas he vvrites of 7. things vvhich the King Chriſt ſhall ſhew vnto Iſrael, you onely mention two of them, viz. *the garden of Eden: and the tree of life*; had you but mentioned the other five: the reader might eaſily have diſcerned how vainely you have alledged this teſtimonie: The other 5 things which he ſaith Meſſias ſhall *ſhew* vnto Iſrael are theſe, to wit; *the throne of glory: the lifting vp of* Korah *and his company: Hell; the godly and the iuſt: all the living and the dead:* He ſpeakes here of the garden of Eden, and the tree of life, as he ſpeakes of *Hell:* to be *ſhewed*, he ſpeakes not of enioying: therfore this teſtimony doth not ſo much as prove that *they expected a recovery of the former loſſe:* as you would have it: Much

leſs doth it ſhew that by the garden of Eden or Paradiſe, they vnderſtood *the Kingdome of heaven*, as it ſeemes vnto you: That ſeemes rather to be vnderſtood by *the throne of glory*, which is here diſtinguiſhed from Paradiſe: Leaſt of all doth it ſhew that the ancient Iewes were leſſe ignorant, then the Iewes of our time: for what can be more ignorant then this dreame of theſe 7. ſpectacles to be ſhewed at the Meſſias his coming, whē as not one of them was ſhewed vnto Iſrael according to the meaning of this Rabbine? 2. They that do but conſider what other vaine and ſenſeleſs things he writes in his numbers in the ſame place, may diſcerne what a carnal Rabbine this *Elias* was; as namely, that 7. ſorts of men are accurſed, which vvant phylacteries on their head and armes, fringes on their coates, poſt-papers on their gates, ſhooes on their feet; which have no wife: nor Child: which teach not their Children; which go not to their meeting houſe: which run not after the commandements: which eate with vnwaſhen hands: That there vvere 7. men over whom *jetſer haragh* or evill concupiſcence had no power, viz. *Abraham, Iſaak, Iaakob, Henoch, Moſes, Iſhai, David*: what reaſon is there to ſay thus of theſe, rather then of *Ioſeph, Ioſhua, Samuel, Elias, Eſaias, &c.*

// Annot. ibid on Gen. 3.

But you proceed, and ſay further; // *And that the Iewes vnderſtood not theſe things carnally, appeareth by theſe words of theirs. In the world to come there is no eating or drinking, nor any other of the things, which the bodies of the Sonnes of Adam, have need of in this world: as ſitting and ſtanding and ſleep, and death & ſorow and mirth and the like: ſo our ancient Wiſemen have ſayd, In the world to come, there is no eating nor drinking nor vſe of mariage but the iuſt do ſit with their crownes vpon their heads, and have the fruition of the glory of the Maieſty of God. Maimony in miſn. treat. of Repentance, Chap. 8. Sect. 2.* Herevnto I anſwer.

"In Tiſhbi in Athad.

1. The *World to come* whereof the Rabbines often ſpeak, is diverſly taken in their writings: *Elias Levita* " ſhewes that it is taken 3. wayes, for the dayes of the Meſſias: for the time that immediately followes death: and for the day of judgement: The

The ſame is " noted by others alſo out of *Don Iſaak Abarbinel.* Now *Maimony* in this place alledged by you, ſpeaking of the world to come either in the ſecond or third acception, doth not at all deny, exclude or remoove a carnall vnderſtanding of the other Iewiſh Rabbines touching the garden of Eden and the tree of life in the ſuppoſed time of their Meſſias his coming and living vpon earth: though they thought there was no eating, drinking, or marying after the day of judgement, this proves not that they thought ſo touching the time of their *Meſſias* his converſing with them on earth. *R. Abraham Aben Ezra* alſo doth very plainely and diſtinctly ·/· ſhew the opinion of the Rabbines herein, namely that when thoſe that dyed in the captivitie are rayſed vp at the coming of their redeemer, *then they ſhall be delighted* or feaſted *with Leviathan, with Ziz, and with Behemoth, and ſhall dye againe the ſecond time, and ſhall live againe at the reſurrection of the dead in the world to come, where they do not eate or drinke, but onely enioy the brightnes of Schecinah, or the divine preſence.* And thus diſtinguiſhing the two worlds to come, he declares that in the firſt they did expect a carnall & earthly feaſting and banquetting of the bodies that roſe againe, though after the day of judgement they beleeved it ſhould be otherwiſe.

" Citante Druſio; præterit. on Mat. 12. 32

·/· Comment. on Dan. 12. 2.

2. Though they thought there was no vſe of mariage and materiall food after the generall judgement, yet they expected a moſt carnall vſe of mariage for their Meſſias on earth, and as is recorded in the artickles of their faith, they beleeved, that // *every King of the gentiles ſhould count it their hovour to give their daughters vnto him: and though Kings daughters were his wives, yet the Queene an Iſraeliteſſe ſhould ſit at his right hand in a crowne of the gold of Ophir, &c. That his other wives ſhould come vnto him at certaine times when they were called to enter in vnto the King, but that the Queene his cheefe wife ſhould evermore be in his bed chamber, &c. that after he had lived many yeares he ſhould dye with honour & his Sonne ſhould reigne after him and his ſonnes Sonne, &c.* And ſundry teſtimonies of ſcripture are in the ſame place per-

// Emunath Ieh ad p. 54. 55.

verted by them for the proofe of this their carnall opiniõ. And beſides that which is before noted touching their feaſting with the wine of Paradiſe, the carnall boldnes of the ancient Rabbines in deſcribing the banquets of that expected time of their Meſſias, is yet greater: in that they preſume to determine the largenes of the cups that ſhall then be vſed, ſaying that "*the cup whereof David ſhal drink in the world to come conteyneth two hundred, one and twentie meaſures or logs: as it is ſayd, my cup is full: revaiah according to the Gematria is ſo*": The ground of this myſterie is taken from the words of *pſ.23.5. Coſi revaiah*, *my cup is full*; where the numerall letters of the word *revaiah* according to the Cabaliſts obſervation do expreſſe this Number 5 to vvit. *R* in Hebrew account ſtanding for *200*, *v* for *6*, *i* for *10*, & *h* for *5*. and theſe added togather make *221*, the meaſure of that royall cup.

" Thalmud in Ioma, c. 8. Fol. 110.

3. You alledge the teſtimony of *Maimony* by the halfes, and thereby hide the abſurdity of that Infidel which is meet to be knowne, that the reader be not deceyved by you. *Maimony* ſayth indeed that *in the world to come, there is neither eating nor drinking*, &c. But he ſaith vvithall in the ſame Chapter and Section alledged by you, that [a] *in the world to come there is neither body nor bodily ſubſtance* (of any perſon,) *but the ſoules of the righteous alone without bodies, as the miniſtring Angels without bodie*. This he would prove from the ſaying of their vviſe men that ſay, in the vvorld to come there is neither eating nor drinking, &c. *Behold* (ſaith he) *it is made plaine vnto thee that there is no body there becauſe there is no eating & drinking there*, &c And [b] afterwards againe he vvould ſhew this from the [c] words of *Abigail* vnto *David*, that there is *no body there, but a bundle of life*, &c. And againe he ſaith, *all the good things that the prophets propheſyed of for Iſrael, they were nothing els but things for the body, which Iſrael ſhall enioy in the dayes of the King Meſſias, in the time that he ſhall turne the Kingdome to Iſrael*, &c. Thus doth the place alledged ſhew what a carnall opinion *Maimony* had concerning the *Meſſias*, and how carnally the Rabbines did vnderſtand

[a] Miſneh, in Teſhubah cap. 8. Sec. 2.

[b] Sec. 3.

[c] 1 Sam. 25

ſtand the ſpirituall promiſes and prophecies concerning Chriſt, quite contrary to that which you would make your readers to beleeve. Though they imagined a reſurrection of the body to live vpon earth againe with their *Meſsias*, yet they denyed the reſurrection of the body to live in heaven therewith after the laſt judgement. Thus you deale with the teſtimonies of the Rabbines, as huckſters with their deceitfull merchandiſe: you paint and colour them, and ſet a deceitfull gloſſe vpon them, that ſo you might the better vent theſe Rabbinicall vvares.

4. How can you alledge this teſtimony of *Maimony* to ſhew a difference betwixt the ancient Rabbines and the Iewes that now live, touching their opinion of Eden and the tree of life to be enioyed by them, ſeing *Maimony* is of ſo great credit with them now at this preſent? where is there a Rabbine or Iew that now differs from him herein and will not acknowledge as much as is conteyned in this your allegation? This being ſo, the oppoſition which you make betwixt the ancient and later Iewes in this matter touching their expectation of recovery of their loſſe by Chriſte is very vaine.

ANother inſtance of your perverting the meaning of the Rabbines, as though they tooke *Michael* to be Chriſte, is to be obſerved in you, in that you ſay, concerning the man that Iaakob wreſtled withall: "*The Ancient Iewiſh Rabbines acknowledged this Angel to be Chriſte: Our doctours of bleſſed memorie* (*R. D. Kimchi, on Hoſ.12.4.*) *have ſayd this Angel was Michael: and of him he ſaith* (*Gen 48.16.*) *the Angel that redeemed me frõ all evil.* Then you adde; *Micael is Chriſte the Arch-Angel, Dan. 10. 21. Iude 9. Rev.12,7. Later Rabbines do feigne, that this was Eſaus Angel, who ſought to hinder Iacob*, &c. The like obſervation you have elſ where alſo, as though they tooke Michael to be Chriſte: Hercvnto I anſwer.

" Annot. on Gen. 32 24.

1. Your oppoſition here alſo betwixt the ancient and the later Rabbines is vaine. For it doth not appeare that the doctours of bleſſed memorie whom *Kimchi* ſpeakes of, were more ancient, then thoſe Rabbines that feigne this perſon that vvreſtled

" Annot. on Gen. 31 11. & on Exod. 14. 19.

led with Iaakob, to be Esaws Angel. *R. D. Kimchi* in his commentarie even vpon the same verse alledged here by you doth twise give vnto his owne Father *Ioseph Kimchi* that title *of blessed memorie*, yet was he not more ancient then *R. Solomon Iarchi* who // expoundes that wrestler to be Esaws Angel. *David Kimchi* is recorded to have lived anno 1190, and Rab. Solomon to have dyed anno 1105. The title of *blessed memorie* doth not carie any such antiquity with it, as you would here make vs beleeve.

// Comment. on Hos. 12. 4.

2. How know you that the later Rabbines feigned this exposition, and that they did not receive it from their ancients, as vvell as many other the like fond interpretations? yea *R. Solomon* when he expoundes that vvrestler to be the Angel of Esaw, he saith it is " *perush rabbothenu* the exposition of their Rabbines: which speech beares as much shevv of antiquiry in it as that of R. Kimchies doth.

" Commẽt on Gen. 32 24.

3. That the Rabbines of old did not take *Michael* to be their *Messias* or *Christe*, it is evident over all by their vvritings. The *Chaldee paraphrast* // framing that last chapter of Solomons song into a dialogue, brings in many persons speaking one after an other: vers 4. the King Messias is brought in giving a charge: v. 5. Solomon speakes as a Prophet vers. 6. the Church or Children of Israel speake: vers. 6. The Lord of the vvorld, God himself is sayd to speak: vers. 7. the Angells of heaven are brought in speaking: and vers. 8. *Michael* the Prince of the nation of Israel, and as a cheefe Angel hath his speech also and so hath a distinct person attributed vnto him divers from the Messias. Againe in the description of those ten miracles which the Iewes do // faigne to be wrought before the coming of the Messias, *Michael* the arch-Angel is evidently noted as a distinct person going before and making way for the Messias the sonne of David, and blowing three times the great horne or trumpet and working wonders therewith: so that by their opinion he must needs be a distinct person from the Messias. The *Chaldee paraphrast* in an " other place as hath bene shevved before ascribes the

// on Cãt. 8. 4. &c.

// Abkath rochel citante Buxtorf Synag. c. 36.

" on ps. 137

the like workes to *Michael and Gabriel*, as being fellow Angels of the like condition. And other Cabalists do likewise shew this; they " write that *Michael* was created in the beginning together with other Angels: they give the like office to him with the rest, and divide workes betwixt them in like sort: In the administration of the world they // give vnto *Michael* the rule and governement of the east winde; to *Raphael* the governement of the west winde: to *Gabriel* the governement of the North winde, and to *Noriel* the rule of the South winde. And *Michael* is reckoned among the 72 Angels by which they ascend vnto God in their prayers. These 4. Angels are also // sayd *to vary the Chariot of the divine maiestie*, and to have waited on God when he came downe on mount Sinai, like vnto 4 standerd bearers, even as the Israelites marched vnder 4. ensignes: *Michael* having the right hand, *Gabriel* the left hand: *Noriel* going before, & *Raphael* following. In the like maner also when they assigne vnto 7. Angels the governement of the 7. dayes, they ascribe vnto him his lot and his portion of one day as they do vnto the rest, " giving Sunday to *Raphael*, Munday to *Gabriel*, Tuesday to *Sammael*, vvednesday to *Michael*, Thursday to *Tzidkiel*, Fryday to *Anael*, and Satterday to *Kephariel*: So that by all these testimonies and many more the like it is apparant, that they did not take *Michael* to be Christe.

" Bereshith Rabba. Fol. 1.

// Ioann. Reuchlin. de arte cabalistica. lib. 3.

// R. Abraham in Zeror Hammor, on Numb. citante Io. Buxtor. de Abbrev. hebr. p. 33.

" Iunius annot. on Tobit. 12. 15.

4. VVhereas you alledge some scriptures to prove that *Michael* is Christe; that is nothing to the question; nothing vnto the honour of the ancient Rabbines vnless you could prove that they held the same thing with the scriptures: but the contrary therevnto is already manifested.

AGaine you seeme to erre from the Rabbines meaning in this, that you ascribe vnto them the knowledge of Christe from their speeches of *Schecinah*. You say, " *By the maiestie or divine presence of the Lord, which the Hebrewes call* Schecinah: *We may well vnderstand Christe: for the Hebrewes vsually distinguish this from God the Father: and say; there is no comming before the blessed and most high King, without schecinah.* R. Menachem on Levit.

" Annot. on Exo. 34 9.

vit.10. Our saviour more plainely saith, No man commeth vnto the Father but by me, Ioh.14 6. Of him the ancient Iewes seeme to speak, vnder this name Schecinah: *though at this day they despise their salvation. See before on* Exod.33.14.15.& 34.6,& 14.19. Answer.

1. VVhereas you do here oppose the anciēt Iewes acknowledging *Schecinah* against the later in regard of their *dispising their salvation*, this is vaine: for both the ancient Iewes you speak of, and this magical *Menachem* with the rest have despised their salvation in refusing Christe, as well as the latter Iewes: and the Iewes at this day againe do acknowledge *Schecinah*, according to the testimonies and speeches of the ancient Iewes. How vniust then is this opposition?

2. If the ancient Iewes spoke of Christe vnder the name of *Schecinah*, then did they despise their salvation, in that they held *Schecinah* to be ·/· one of those 5. things that were wanting in the second temple, whiles our Lord Iesus did live on earth. So they must needes be blasphemers of him and denyers of the Lord of life, looking for an other *Schecinah*.

·/· See before P. 336

3. This word *Schecinah* properly signifies *habitation or dwelling*, and so may be vnderstood and applyed to any speciall revelation of the grace and glory of God resting or dwelling vpon any place or person ordinarily or extraordinarily according to the divers degrees in which it pleaseth him to manifest the same. According to this signification may all the testimonies alledged by you be vnderstood of the Iewes, and yet they still remaine ignorant of the person of Christe. VVhereas you alledge out of *Menachem*, that *there is no comming before God without Schecinah*, this may be vnderstood of some certaine measure of the spirit, required in those that should draw neerer vnto God then the ordinary sort of men: according to the like testimony vvhich you // alledge out of *Maimony* giving a reason vvhy the Priests in the second temple did not enquire of God by vrim and Thummim. *Every Priest that speaketh not by the holy Ghost, and on vvhom the divine maiestie resteth not: they enquire not by him.* And so the saying of *Menachem* hath no affinity with the

// Annot. on Exo.28 30.

the saying of Christ *Ioh.14.6.* For any Priest or godly person might come vnto the Father by Christe, according to the meaning of Christe, though they wanted that extraordinary *Schecinah*. And further how doth this his testimony shew vnto vs their distinction of *God the Father*? &c. As for the other notes you refer vs vnto in *Exo.33. and* 34. by that which is already sayd it may appeare that there is no necessitie of vnderstanding them of Christes person, considering withall, that the Rabbines vse to attribute the titles of Christe vnto the Angels; and that sometimes also the name of God is given vnto the signes and tokens of his presence.

4. Seing *Schecinah* habitation, or dwelling in the Church & in the members thereof is "common to ech person in the trinitie, to the Father and to the holy Ghost as wel as the Sonne; and seing withall that this name of *Schecinah* is by the Chaldee paraphrasts and other writers often attributed to God absolutely considred, what reason have you to restreyne their meaning to the second person in the trinitie?

„ Iohn 14. 17. 23. Eph. 2. 22. 1. Ioh. 4. 15. 16.

5. *R. Moses Bar Maimon* writing of *Schecinah* or habitation, saith; " *where so ever this word is spoken of God, it signifieth the firmnes of his glory, that is, of his glory created in that place, or the firmnes of his care abiding vpon any thing*: And so he brings example, that so the glory of God dwelt vpon mount Sinai: According to this his interpretatiō may that place of the Prophet be vnderstood: ·/· *And the Lord shall create vpon every place of mount Sion and the assemblies thereof a cloude and smoke by day, &c.* Now while the Rabbines do thus expound the word of the outward sensible tokens of Gods glorious protection and care, and of the graces created or infused vpon his Church, we can not justly from this their phrase conclude, that they spoke of the increated Sonne of God vnder this name.

" Moreh Nebuchim, Chelek. 1. perek. 25.

·/· Esa. 4:5.

6. It is recorded, that || *Hillel the old man had 80. disciples: 30. of them were worthy that the* Schecinah *should rest vpon them, as vpon Moses: other 30. of them were worthy that the Sun should stand still vnto them, as vnto Ioshua the son of Nun: 20 of them, were a mid.*

// Thalmud in Babbathra Fol. 134. and in Succa Fol. 28.

of a middle ſort, &c. Hēce it appeares that theſe Rabbines did vnderſtand by *Schecinah the more high degree* of knowledge and grace of the ſpirit: for were they ſo ſenſeleſs to think that the firſt 30 onely were partakers of Chriſte, and that the other 50. were without the Meſſias, or that their graces vvere not from him, whom they ſhould acknowledge ſo boũtifull vnto others? If ſo, then ſurely you have no reaſon to think the later Rabbines more ignorant then thoſe ancient dotards that were ſo far from the knowledge of the way to ſalvation and life.

7. If *Michael, Gabriel, Nuriel and Raphael* do cary the Chariot of *Schecinah*, as was noted before according to the opinion of the Rabbines: then is it probable that either they thought *Michael* was not Chriſte, contrary to your imaginatiõ; or els that they thought not *Schecinah* to be Chriſte, as it yet ſeemes vnto you: for ſhould the Meſsias be both horſe and rider at once in their account?

8. VVhereas the *Thargum or Chaldee paraphraſt* ſaith on *Pſ. 110. 1. The Lord ſayd in his word, &c.* If by *word* he meant the Meſsias, according to "your opinion, then doth he alſo vpon the ſame pſalme plainely diſtinguiſh *Schecinah* from the Meſſias: for there he ſaith further verſ. 5. The *Shecinta or Schecinah of the Lord is at thy right hand*: So by your owne expoſition if they make *Schecinah* a helper to Chriſte at his right hand it will follow that the ancient Iewes ſhould not thinke Chriſte to be *Schecinah*. And many other places might eaſily be alledged out of the ſame paraphraſt, to ſhew that the Iewes held the Meſsias and *Schecinah* to be two ſeverall things: but this may ſuffice for the preſent.

" Preface to Annot. on Gen.

VVIth this kind of errour we may reckon your miſinterpretation of ſome of the divers readings recorded by the Maſorites: for example, the word *jadau*, you expound it thus, a *his hands*) *or, his hand: that is, ech of his hands: the Hebrew hath both readings: the firſt by the vowels and margine: the other by the letters in the line.* And againe, the like: vvhen after the ſame maner, you interpret the word *berichau*, to ſignify b *barrs or, barr:*

a Annot. on Exod. 38. 19.
b Annot. on Exo. 35 11. & on Exo. 39. 33.

barr: &c. But herein you erre, ſeing both the readings whether in the margine or in the line, are to be tranſlated his *hands*, his *barres*: and neither of them his *hand*, his *barr*: and the ſame is to be held for the other diuers readings wherevnto you refer vs in *Levit.* 9. 22. *Deut.* 2. 33. and the like. If the word read in the line had had *Cholem* annexed with *vau*, then ſhould it have bene ſo as you ſay: but ſeing it hath there a *kamets* coming before *vau*; that c kinde of affix is ſtill a note of pluralitie in the ſignification of words. Though ſometimes *jod* be wanting in the laſt ſyllable of ſuch words by a grammatical figure, yet do they not therfore ceaſſe to reteyne a plural ſignification; as is d ſhewed in divers words, in *ghnammudau, pillars*: Exod. 27. 11. *Tabbeghnothau, rings*, *Exo.* 28. 28. vvhich are of the ſame forme with the words *jadau & berichau* as they are written within the line in the places above mentioned. Could you ſhew that the words in the line, had other maner of vowels belonging vnto them, then vnto thoſe in the margine; then ſhould you have ſome reaſon for that you vvrite here in your annotations: But ſeing it is obſerved concerning thoſe 848 divers readings, that the readings in the line and the margine differ onely in letters, and that e there is no difference in the vowelles in any of them: and ſeing the copies of the holy ſcripture do alſo witneſſe the ſame thing vnto vs: therfore had you no warrant to vvrite ſo as you have done. Theſe things may ſeeme ſmall: but ſeing they concerne the purity of the holy ſcriptures, therfore are they not to be deſpiſed, eſpecially of you, which would have the divers readings to be both written by the ſpirit of God.

c R. D. Kimchi in Miclol. Fol. 197.
d Ioa. Buxt. Theſaur. gramm. lib. 2. c. 8.
e Elias Levita Maſor. hammaſor. præfat. 3.

HItherto alſo may be referred your vnſound obſervation vpon the word *Zebojim*: when you note, that f *it is written by the letters in the line* Zebiim, of Zebi *which ſignifieth* glorie, pleaſantnes, & a Roe: *by which name the pleaſant and glorious Land of Iſrael is called, in Ezek. 20. 6. But by the vowels and in the margine noted to be read* Zebojim, *as being vnworthy the pleaſant name.* Here you erre many wayes, 1. There is no warrant

f Annot. on Gen. 14 2.

to say *it is written by the letters in the line* Zebiim; for the letters in the line without vowels, do yeeld no word at all: if you deviſe vowels for it, as you do, then you deſtroy the tradition of the *Maſorites*, who (as I ſhewed before from *Elias Levita*) do admit no difference of vowels in any of their divers readings: And whereas they make two divers readings: if your obſervation were admitted, we ſhould then have three, viz. the firſt, *Zebiim*: the ſecond *Zebojim*, without *vau* as it is now in the text: the third *Zebojim* with *vau* as it is in the margine: the firſt deviſed by yourſelf: the two latter already receyved by the *Maſorites*. 2, if difference of vowels vvere to be admitted in theſe divers readings, yet not in ſuch maner as you feigne: for you erre in deriving *Zebiim* of *Zebi*; by putting *Chirek* for *Kamets*; *Zebiim* for *Zebaim*: This your errour is plainely reprooved by the g cheefeſt of the Rabbines that ſhew the forming of this vvord. 3, ſuppoſe *Zeboim* was put for *Zebiim*, yet have you no reaſon hence to gather that it vvas *vnworthy the pleaſant name*: for vvhy may not *Zeboim* come of *Zebi* alſo, and ſo cary in it a ſignification of glory and pleaſantnes as vvel as your imagined *Zebiim*? And if *Zeboim* do not come of *Zebi* then ſhevv from vvhence it comes and vvhat ſignification it hath wherein no glory and pleaſantnes is implyed. 4, by this kind of collection where you thus exclude and remoove the ſignification of one of the divers readings from the ſubiect ſpoken of, you do alſo overthrow your interpretation of theſe divers readings in other places, where you labour to reteyne, to eſtabliſh and to apply the ſignificatiõ of them both vnto the ſubiect matter that is mentioned with them. VVith ſuch inconveniences are you juſtly entangled, vvhiles you maintaine theſe divers readings for grounds of doctrine and inſtruction: vvhiles the Maſorites traditions are choſen of you as your text, vvhich thus you preach on. Hereby you run into abſurdities vvhich even the Rabbines themſelves are free from.

g Kimchi in Miclol, Fol. 239.

CAP.

CHAP. VI.

A Sixth Scandall is that blaſphemous aſſertion touching the help of the Rabbines, when as concerning the *Chaldee paraphraſt* and other Hebrew doctours, you ſay that you alledge their expoſitions for two cauſes: *the one, to give light vnto the ordinances of Moſes touching the externall practiſe of them, in the common vvealth of Iſrael, vvhich the Rabbines did record, and vvithout vvhoſe help, many of thoſe legall rites (eſpecially in Exodus and Leviticus) will not vvell be vnderſtood, &c.* To this preſumption I anſwer, in defence of the holy ſcriptures; Preface to Annot. on Geneſis.

Firſt, The law of God is a perfect: and not onely for the truth thereof, but alſo for the perſpicuity, and evidence ſufficiẽt in itſelf (as a divine inſtrument) *to convert the ſoule* from any ſin: to *give vviſedome vnto the ſimple, and to enlighten their eyes* in any doubt or danger: why do you then accuſe them of imperfection, as though the well vnderſtanding of them did depend vpon the records of the Rabbines? The whole ſcripture is b given by inſpiration of God, and is proffitable to teach, to convince, to correct, to inſtruct in righteouſnes that the man of God may be abſolute, being made perfect vnto all good vvorkes: But you contradicting the ſpirit of God tell vs that without help of the Rabbines many legall rites will not be well vnderſtood: and ſo according to your tenent, the man of God cannot be abſolute, nor made perfect vnto all good workes, and to all the workes of his miniſtery as to expound Exodus & Leviticus well, vnleſs he be a Scholler of the Rabbines: To be a diſciple of the Prophets and Apoſtles, and of Chriſt Ieſus himſelf is not ſufficient with you, vnleſs he be alſo a ſtudent and proficient in the Schoole of the Thalmud. As c *Sampſon* once vpbraided the Philiſtines, that they could not have found out his riddle, but that they plowed with his heifer: even ſo the Iewes at this day might vpbraid the Chriſtians, & tell vs out of your

a Pſ. 19. 7. 8 & 119. 130. Prov. 1. 1.--6. & 8. 8. 9.

b 2 Tim. 3. 16. 17.

c Iudg. 14. 18.

your mouth, (if there were any truth in this your assertion) that we could not have founde our their mysteries, nor well vndestood the ordinances of Moses, except we had plowed with their heifer of the *Thalmud*. You ought to feare the Lord who is a jealous God and d will not give his glory to the Thalmudists: e *Ezra* and f *Paul* and g others honoured the scriptures, and did well expound them when they gave the vnderstanding thereof by the scripture it self, and by comparing them togather: but you dishonour the scriptures and take away a great part of their glory, when you say they *will not be well vnderstood without help of Rabbines:* yea you are herein guilty of the same blasphemy with the Rabbines themselves: and your speech is in effect one with theirs, who are noted to affirme that h *the law written cannot be expounded or made plaine without the help of the mouth-tradition*: for from those pretended Thalmudicall traditions are your explications drawne. How do you forget yourself & your former writings in which you profess touching the Shepheard of Rome, that i you will never go over the *Alpes* to fetch your food from him? And yet here you run over the *Alpes*, yea over the mountaines of *Ararat* to fetch your food from the *Babylonish Thalmud* as though you could not be wel fed without Rabbinicall chaffe. Heretofore you could vvrite and maintaine, that k *It is a ly against the truth to say, that the holy Bible which we have written, doth not sufficiently expresse divers mysteries of vs to be beleeved:* And yet here to make vvay for the broaching and venting of your Rabbinicall vvares, you contradict yourself: for if many legall rites will not be well vnderstood without the Rabbines, then doth not the holy Bible sufficiently expresse divers mysteries vnto our vnderstanding: And thus yourself are guilty of the like ly against the truth, whiles to vvin credit vnto the Rabbinicall expositions, you spare not to slander both the perspicuity of the scriptures, and also the l grace of God given vnto the Churches of Christ so abundantly in these last dayes: as though the spirit of truth, and all the gifts which Christ ascēding on high hath given to vs could not lead men to vnderstād the

d Esa. 48. 11
e Neh. 8. 8.
f Act. 9. 22. & 17. 2. 3.
g Act. 18. 28.
h R. Bechai in Cad hak kemach. Fol. 77.
i Answ. to Ioh. Ainsw. p. 22.
k Ibid. p. 153.
l Ioh. 1. 16. & 7. 37. 38 & 14. 26. & 16. 13. Eph. 4. 8-14. Esay. 29. 18. & 35. 7. 8. Heb. 8. 10. 11.

the scriptures well: as though without a threed of direction frō those infidel Iewes, that deny Christe, vve could not come out of the pretended Labyrinth of the scriptures.

Secondly, as for the externall practise of Moses ordinances in the common wealth of Israel, recorded by the Rabbines: what extraordinary light is to be expected from those blinde guides whom our Saviour every where condemneth for their ignorance, blindenes and superstition? even the Pharisees, those more ancient Rabbines, (by which title you do so often commend them) were ignorant of the law, and by their traditions receyved from their Elders had falsifyed & corrupted the right practise of the ordinances of Moses, and to magnifye their owne devises and inventions, they m wrested and changed the law, & the right observation of the whole decalogue and of every commandement in the same: vnto the legall rites they joyned a burden of their owne traditions, mens precepts, vaine worship, plants which the heavenly father had never planted, and made the commandements of God of no authoritie, for these things Christ often reproved them, denounced woe vnto them, and for this cause the Iewes againe denounce woe vnto our Blessed Saviour and n blaspheme him wickedly with words which I abhor to mention, as being a contemner of their wise men. And is it not madnes then to think, that the law of God will not be well vnderstood, without the help of such accursed and woful guides?

m Mat. 5. 20.--43. & 15. 2, 3.--14. & 16. 12, & 23. 16, &c.

n Thalmud tract. Gittin Cap. 5.

But to give the reader some more particular instances of this; Let it be considered what a sory change you have made in leaving the ministers of Christe to be come a disciple of your Iew-doctours. Against the Church of God in *England* you protest on this maner and say vnto vs: *We hold that you have poysoned all the fountaines of sincere doctrine and pervert the whole Testament, & turne away the practise thereof by your damnable false ex positions, yea that you teach not one poynt sincerely.* If this were true then had you reason to separate: and not to heare such damnable doctrine: but let vs see whether those fountaines be purer, with-

H. Bar. refut. of Giff. p. 214

out drinking whereat you would make vs beleeve we could not vvell vnderstand some parts of the holy scripture.

AGainst the first commandemēt, your Rabbines teach vs to choose a false God without Christ: they impugne the doctrine of the holy Trinitie, as I shewed before. They teach many things not agreeing with the nature & maiestie of God: as that he should[a] play thre houres in the day with Leviathā; that[b] in the day he exercises himself in the scripture, & in the night studies the Thalmud: that in the[c] houre when he remēbers the dispersion of Israel, he lets two teares fall into the great Sea and makes lamentation for the destruction of the temple: That the[d] Sun and moone being created equal in light at first, vpon the complaint of the moone, he diminished her light: but the moone expostulated so long vvith God, that as they write he appoynted a sin offring to be brought for himself for a reconciliation: even that Goate offred for a sin offring in the beginning of every moneth. That the Sunne, Moone, and Starres are living creatures having reason and speech, the Iewes hold firmely as I noted before: and therfore no vvonder that the Moone should so plead with God. As the creatures pray in their wants so they teach that the creatour himself doth make prayers: *R. Iohanan* in the name of *R. Iosei* * proves it by that place in *Esa.* 56 7. where God calles the temple *Beth tephillathi*; *The house of my prayer*: They note it is not called the house of their prayers, but of his. And *R. Zutra bar Tobijah* shewes what his prayer is, viz. that his mercy may overcome his vvrath and his other properties, &c. Concerning the anger of God, they vvrite further in the same place, that God is alwayes angry once in a day: vvhich they would prove from that saying *Ps. 7. 11.* But this anger they say is but for a moment: and how much is a moment? They teach that if an houre be divided into five millions, eight thousand, eight hundred, eighty eight parts, then a moment is one of them. They say no creature knowes that moment save onely *Balaam:* because it is sayd, he saw the vision of the almighty, &c. *Numb.* 24. and therfore in *Balaams* time God was not angry once

[a] Rasi on Psa. 104. 26
[b] Chald. paraphr. on Cant. 5. 10.
[c] Thalmud in Beracoth Cap. 9. Fol. 59.
[d] Thalm. in Cholin. c. 3. F. 60 & Rasi on Numb. 28. 15.
* Thalmud in Beracoth, c. 1. Fol. 7.

once a day according to his maner, least *Balaã* should have cursed Israel in that moment, and so destroyed them: this they will have to be noted from *Numb.* 23. 8. *with Mica.* 6. 5. For it is held that if in that moment of Gods anger any man should curse an other, he must needes dy presently: and that men cannot prevayle vvith God in that moment: And herevpon they vvrite also that God bade *Moses* to stay and waite till his face or anger vvas past, that then he vvould give him rest, viz. vvhen the moment of his pasion and indignation vvas over: that they would prove from *Exod. 33. 14.* Concerning that moment of indignation they say that the cockes then standing vpon one foote, their combes become pale and loose their rednes, &c. Into such a horrible pit of ignorance of their creatour, have these miserable Iewes bene cast, by the heavy hand of God vpō them. Their confidence in creatures appeares by the sundry sorts of[e] charmes vvhich they have taken from the names of Angels vvritten on their vvalles and dores in time of danger. Yea as the rude *Indians* are sayd to offer sacrifice to the Divel for feare, least he hurt them: so the[f] Iewes themselves vvrite of their offring or gift, vvhich in the feast of reconciliation they give vnto the wicked spirit or fiend vvhom they call *Samael.*

[e] Elias Levita in Tishbi in Lilith.
[f] Ibidem in Samaël.

IN stead of Gods true and pure worship required in the second commandement, they bring in a Sea of superstition: In stead of worshiping Christ, they have[g] prayers against him, so execrable, as that I think it not meet to rehearse the same. And for other prayers how vaine are they? Among the 5 things that stay them from prayer, one is when their hands are not cleane: And of this they vvrite, that[h] if a man have a journey by the vvay, and the time of prayer be come and a man have no vvater: if there be betwixt him and the vvater the space of 4. miles or 8000. cubites, he is first to go vnto the place of vvater, to vvash and then after that to pray: but if there be betvvixt him & the vvater a greater space then this, he is to vvrive or rub his hands vvith gravel or dust or the like and then to pray. But this di-

[g] Seb. Munst. de fide Iudæ: p. 110.
[h] Maimony in Mishneh, in Tephillah, or treat. of prayer, c. 4. Sect. 1. 2. 5

ſtance of 4. miles they do there expound of the place before them; but for the place after them, they are to returne but one mile back for vvater and no more: This vvaſhing of hands they require for every ſet time of prayer beſide the morning: for then they require the vvaſhing of face, hands and feet before prayer. For præparation to prayer, they require a ſettling of the mind and thoughts: And therfore they teach, i if a man returne from a journey and be vveary or troubled it is vnlawfull for him to pray: and their vviſe men ſay, a man ſhall be vveary three dayes vntill he reſt and refreſh his mind, and after that he may pray.

i Ibidem, Sec. 15.

In the time of prayer they vſe phylacteries: and of theſe *R. Hanina* in the name of *R. Iohanan* gives this rule; that k they may not make the phylacteries of the head, to ſerve for phylacteries vnto the hand: but the hand-phylacteries are allowed to be made head phylacteries: becauſe they may not deſcend from a greater holynes to a leſſe: but contra. Touching the hand whereon theſe phylacteries are to be vvorne, the Rabbines ſay, l it is the left hand; for proofe thereof they alledge theſe ſcriptures, *his hand hath founded the earth, and his right hand hath ſpread out the heavens*: and againe, *ſhe put her hand to the nayle, and her right hand to the hammer of the workmen, Iudg. 5.* But if a man be left-handed, then he is to vveare them on his right hand, becauſe that is vnto him as his left hand. The like care they have about their *zizith* or fringes vvith as many ſuperſtitions as there be threeds in a fringe. Further, m if a man ſeek vviſedome in his prayer, he is to pray towards the South; if he ſeek riches, he is to pray towards the North: and the reaſon that they give hereof is, becauſe the table vvas ſet on the North-ſide, and the Candleſtick on the South-ſide, (*Exod.* 40. 22. 24.) VVhen for their neceſſities they go into the place, where they think it is not meet that the Angels ſhould be preſent vvith them: they have n a ſet forme of prayer, in vvhich they deſire thoſe Angels, the miniſters of the moſt high to keep them, to help them and to ſtay for them, vntill they come forth of that houſe: vvith many

k R. Alphes in phillim, or treat. of phylacteries, Fol. 78. A.

l R. Alphes ibid. f. 81. a

m Thalmud in Babha bathra c. 2. Fol. 25.

n Arba turim, Orach Chaijm, tract. 1. ſig. 3.

many other ſuperſtitions annexed, not fit to be named. They think alſo, that o there is an evill ſpirit abiding vpon their hãds vntill they have vvaſhed, &c. VVhen they are ſet to pray, they tell vs that p though a King ſalute them, they may not anſwer him, and though a ſerpent bite them by the heele, they may not ceaſſe. Yet the gloſſe vpon that place, helpes to mitigate the matter a litle, and ſaith, q though they may not ceaſſe to ſpeak, yet they may go aſide to ſhake of the ſerpent, to avoyd danger &c. After prayer for the further confounding or r *aſtoniſhing of Satan*, as they ſay, they vſe ſometimes to ſound a Trumpet, or to take vp a great ſhowte together, without ſounding of the Trumpet. He that kilies a bird or beaſt, ſ muſt cover the blood & a ſet forme of prayer or bleſſing is appoynted for that action; except it be, whẽ they kill a beaſt which they call *Cavi* begottẽ of a Roe and a hee-goat: though they cover the blood thereof, yet may they not doe it with prayer & bleſſing: evẽ as they teach that t they are to circumciſe an Hermaphrodite, a perſon that is both male and female, but without that ſet forme of bleſsing appoynted for the action of circumciſion. And infinite are the traditions wherein they put holynes and religion: Yea they u tell vs of 300. traditions about one kinde of leprous ſpot: and of three thouſand traditions about the planting of Cucumbers beſides thoſe which are for the plucking of them vp: And how many millions of ſuperſtitions muſt they then have for all other things? But if there were nothing els but their ſet formes of prayers which they vſe: according to your profeſsion they muſt be violatours of the ſecond commandement & great Idolaters. And touching theſe they ſay, that w *Ezra* the ſcribe and his conſiſtory ordeyned the forme of all their bleſſings, & that it is not meet to adde vnto one of them or to diminiſh from them: and that whoſoever changeth the coyne which their wiſe men have coyned in their bleſsings, cannot but erre, &c. If in any thing the Rabbines might know the external practiſe in the common wealth of Iſrael, then in this generall poynt, that they vſed ſet formes of prayer, though they

o Ibid. ſig. 4

p R. Alphes in Beracoth, c. 4. F. 22.

q R. Ionah commẽt. on R. Alphes.

r Orach Chajim, in Roſch haſſchanah ſig. f 81. & in Seder Tekiath Shophar, ſig. 596.

ſ Iore deghnah, Treat. of covering blood, ſig. 28.

t Tract. Milah. ſig. 365.

u Thalmud in Sanhedrin, c. 7. F. 68.

vv Maimony in Miſneh, in Beracoth, c. 1. and in keriath ſhema, c. 1. ſec. 7.

might erre touching ſome particular prayers: If in this matter they cannot help you better to vnderſtand the practiſe of Gods people, then in none other rites. Shew if you can, how we may regard them in any tradition, if not in this.

FOr the third commandemēt, they have alſo moſt vaine doctrines, touching taking the name of God in vaine. They ſay, whoſoever x deſtroyes any of the holy and pure names of God, he is *Lukah*, to be beaten or whipt: for proofe they alledge *Deut.* 12, 3. 4: Now theſe are the 7. names, *Iehovah*, *Adonai*, *Eloah*, *Elohim*, *Ehieh*, *Shaddai*, *Tſebaoth*: whoſoever blots out but one letter of theſe names, he is *Lukah*, to be beaten: And further, they ſay, whoſoever blots out any letter added to the name of God, in the forepart thereof, as L in *Laihovah*: and B in *Belohim*, that is free: but the letters added to the name of God, in the afterpart thereof, as C in *Elohecaon* M in *Elohecem*, may not be blotted out, but are holy as the name of God. Yet he that blotts them out is not *Lukah*: but puniſhed with a leſſer kind of puniſhment, with *Maccath Marduth*, *&c.* Againe they hold it for an heynous ſin, that any man ſhould pronounce this name *Iehovah*: onely they y allow it to be pronounced in the ſanctuary, and that onely by the Prieſts and that not at all times but onely in the ſolemne bleſsing appoynted *Numb.* 6, & that alſo with a ſwift voyce, that the ſound thereof may be as it were ſwallowed vp. The reaſon alledged is, becauſe the Lord ſaith, this *is my name for ever, and this is my memorial Exod.* 3. 15, vvhere they do not read, *leghnolam*, for ever; but *leghnallem*, to hide, to conceale: as though God would have his name *Iehovah* concealed, & *Adonai* or *Elohim* to be his memorial pronounced n ſtead of it: And divers like ſuperſtitions they have about the name of 12. letters, and the name of 42 letters. Yet they z hold that in the world to come, viz. vvhen their Meſsias comes, that then it ſhalbe pronounced of all; becauſe it is ſayd, *Zach.* 14. 9. that *there ſhalbe one Lord, and his name one*, to vvit, the name *Iehovah* to be read as it is written, &c. Moreover as they abuſe the name of God, by obtruding all their traditions vpon

x Maimony in Miſneh, tract. Iesudei hatthorah, Cap. 6, 1, 2, 3, &c.

y Thalmud in Kiddushin c. 4. f. 71, & in Sotah, c. 7. Fol. 37.

z Aben Ezra on Zach. 14. 9 Thalmud in Pesachim, c. 3. Fol. 50.

vpon him, as if he had given them at Sinai; by perverting the law that he hath given: ſo do they alſo by concealing ſome parts of ſcripture, when they ſay, a *ſome of them are to be read and expounded*: ſome of them *are to be read and not expounded: and ſome of them neither to be read nor expounded*; And divers inſtances they give for ech of theſe kindes. And not onely this, but they do alſo ſhew in ſtrange maner, how a great part of the ſcriptures ſhalbe aboliſhed, even then when they will have their traditions to continue: they ſay, that b *all the bookes of the Prophets and Cethubim* (viz. Iob, pſalm, proverbs, canticles, Daniel, Ezra, &c.) *ſhall ceaſſe in the dayes of Meſsias, except the volume of Eſter: behold it ſhall continue as the 5. bookes of the law and as the traditions of the law* ſchebeal-peh, *delivered by mouth, which are not to ceaſſe for ever.* This is the blaſphemie of your *Maimony*. Concerning othes, as our Saviour in his time c reproved divers of their errours: ſo are their later Rabbines alſo to be condemned. In that d ſtory where the 7 places of paradiſe are deſcribed by them, with their ſeverall glory, and with the ſeverall perſons that are in ech of thoſe places, they ſay, that when the ſame were ſhewed vnto *Iehoſhua ben Levi* by the Angell of death at the commandement of God, he ſodainely lept from the divel into that place, and ſwore by the name of God that he would not depart thence; Herevpon though the Angel of death would have drawne him back, and though the miniſtring Angels alſo complayned hereof vnto God, yet becauſe of his oth, it was concluded of God that he ſhould ſtay there, it having bene found that this Rabbine had never made falſe oth before. The like liberty and preſumption in ſwearing do others of them commend vnto vs on earth, when as ſome of their great Rabbines having a ſpeciall requeſt vnto God do tell him with an oth that they vvill not depart from the place where they ſtand vntill they ſee their deſire granted. Thus it is e accorded of *Chone Hammagal*, that in a time of great drought when as other humiliation would not prevaile, he ſhut vp himſelf in our with a Cake, and prayed thus, *O Lord of the world, thy Chil-*

a R. Alphes in Megilla, c. 4. f. 365.

b Maimony in Miſneh, tract. Megillah, c. 2. ſec. 18.

c Mat. 5. 34 & 23. 16, &c.

d Sebaſt. Munſter, Annot. in Gen. 2.

e Thalmud in Taanith, or treat. of faſting, c. 3.

Children direct their eyes vnto me, knowing that I am deare vnto thee as a Childe vnto his Father: I sweare by thy holy name, that I will not depart hence, vntill thou have pitie vpon thy infants: This being done there came shewers of raine. And thus *R. Solomon Iarchi* their great *Parshandatha* or cheef expositour of the law, interpreting those words of the prophet *I will stand vpon my watch*, f writes hereupon: *ghnugah ghnag Habakuk*, &c. that is to say, Habakkuk baked a Cake and stood in it or by it, and sayd, *I will not depart hence vntill I heare what he will say vnto me, &c.* And this exposition is also related by *Kimchi* in the same place. This practise is like vnto the dealing of some presumptuous persons in these our times, of whom I have heard, that coming vnto persons possessed and taking with them a pound of raysins do avow they will eat nothing els vntill the persons be dispossessed. Many other vaine doctrines they have touching othes & blasphemies but I may not insist further vpon them.

f Rasi & Kimchi comment. on Habak. c. 2. 1.

TOuching the obseruation of the Sabath taught in the 4th. commandement, they g shew from their wise men, that the 7. planets have each of them a severall day in the week assigned vnto them wherein they beare rule and shew their force; that among these planets *Saturne* & *Mars* are hurtfull starres above the rest: that those who begin any work or enter vpon any journey when they beare rule shall not prosper but come to some hurt: that among all the dayes of the week there is not to be found any day and night together wherein those two hurt full planets beare rule save onely vpon the Sabath day: & that therfore it is not convenient for men to be then exercised in wordly affaires, save onely in the service of God: This is layd downe as a reason of rest vpon the seventh day: If this were just and sound, it should go ill with Christians who have their Sabath now changed from the seventh to the first day of the week. Now for the keeping of this Sabath, they propound most carnall and absurd obseruations: they then h require that a mā have cleane and faire apparel, and change of apparel; and if a man have not change of apparel, yet they require him so to weare

g R. Abraham Aben Ezra comment. on Exod. 20. Isaak ben Arama in Akedath Isaak, portâ 45.

h Maimony in Misneh, tract. Schabath, c. 30.

weare it, that it may seeme not to be the common apparel. They binde every man to make 3 banquets on the Sabath, and if it be possible to keep them with wine: to spread the table vpon the evening when the Sabath begins: and to see that it be spread when the Sabath goes out, though a man had no more meate then an Olive to set vpon the same: And for honour of the Sabath, they do then especially commend *taschmish hammittah*, the vse of the mariage bed. And they teach there, that it is vnlawfull to mourne or cry on the Sabath even to pray for cōpassion and to seek mercy from God, even in affliction, except it be extraordinary, as when the citie is beseeged, &c. They say, i whosoever weares armes on the Sabath, which are put on like apparel, as helmet, brigandine, and boores of brasse, he is free: but who so caries armes that are not like vnto apparel, as speare sword, bow or the like, he is guilty: That it is vnlawful for a woman to go forth on the Sabath, with a ring which hath a signet vpon it; but if a man do it, he is free: and on the contrary, that it is vnlawfull for a man to go forth on the Sabath with a ring, which hath no signet vpon it, but if a woman do it she is free. They say, k whosoever goes out of his bounds on the Sabath, he is *Lukah* to be beaten; those bounds they describe to be 2000 cubites: but if a man walk through the citie where he lives, though it were as great as *Nineveh*, that it is lawfull. If a mā through ignorance or otherwise exceed that bounds then he hath but 4 cubites left him to stir in. If for performing the necessities of nature he be vrged to go aside, yet he must returne to that place againe, (to his circle.) They teach, that l if one man alone (overtaken vvith the Sabath in his journey) do rest in a plaine and make a trench round about him: if there be in it a space conteyning two measures (of seed,) it is lawfull for him to walk through all that space, but if there be in it more then the space of two measures, then he may not moove aboue 4. cubites: & so it is if there be two men together. But if there be three Israelites or more thē these, behold these are a cāpe, & it is lawfull for them to vvalk for all their necessities, though it

i Ibidem, c. 19. sec. 1, 3.

k Ibid. c. 27.

l Ibid. c. 16. sec. 11.

were divers miles : and this so, that the space of the two measures which they have compassed in be not left voyd vvithout some vessels or implements in the same; otherwise it is vnlawfull for them to moove through the whole trench, but onely for 4. cubites: And a Child may not make vp the number for a campe, &c. If we will beleeve Rabbines this was the external practise of the legal rites in the Iewes common wealth: how should vve vnderstand these things without their help?

FRom the observation of the fift commandement they teach men to go astray both in defect and excesse of giving honour divers wayes: As in Christes time they did frustrate this commandement of God by their sacrilegious [m] *Korban*, in giving that vnto the Priests which they should have bestowed on their parents: So do they still teach men to practise. They say,[n] if a man see a thing lost by his Father, and a thing lost by his Rabbi, he is first to bring the thing lost vnto his Rabbi: If his Father and his Rabbi be laden with burdens, he is first to take of the burden of his Rabbi, then of his father. If his father and his Rabbi be taken captives, he is first to redeeme his Rabbi then his Father. They say in the same place, that it is vnlawfull for a man to teach in the presence of his Rabbi for ever: and whosoever teacheth a tradition in the presence of his Rabbi is guilty of death. If there be the space of 12 miles betwixt him & his Rabbi, and a man ask him a word of the tradition, it is then lawfull to answer him, &c. But for a man to set himself to be seene, and to sit downe to teach whosoever shall ask him: though he be in one end of the world and his Rabbi in the other end of the world, yet it is vnlawfull for him so to teach, vntill his Rabbi dy, or except he get a license from him, &c. If the [o] Father of the house of judgement transgresse, they may nor censure or suspend him for it, but they say vnto him, boast of thy glory and stay at home, &c. If a student, or yong scholler transgresse they may not suspend him openly but in the night, when the Sun is gone downe: and their proofe is as *Raschbal* there noteth, because it is sayd by the Prophet: Thou shalt fall

m Mat. 15. 4. 5. 6.

n Maimony in Misneh, in thalmud thorah, c. 5. sect. 1, &c.

o R. Alphes in Moed Katon, c. 3. Fol. 380.

fall in the day: and *the Prophet shall fall with thee in the night*: Hos. 4. 5. And the night shall cover him (*Mica. 3. 6.*) Againe whereas the law of God appoynteth, that he vvhich curseth Father or Mother shall dy: they do frustrate this commandement, by this distinction, that [p] this is to be vnderstood of such as curse by some of the proper names of God: but if they curse by any of his attributes they are not subiect to this punishment but onely sin as if they should curse any other of Israel, that is not their parent. And where God ordeyned those that smite Father or mother, to be put to death, this they say is to be vnderstood of such smiting where a wound or blew marke followes: and that otherwise it is but as if they had striken an other Israelite, &c. They give this honour vnto their parent of parents, the father of their great court, that the same errour which is an heynous sin in an other, shall not yet be so in him: for whereas they [q] make 4. degrees of transgressiō, viz. 1, against a mans vvill: 2 of errour: 3 of pride: 4 of malice; They do in the same place note, that there is herein this great difference betwixt private men, and their cheefe rulers: namely that if a private man work any transgression and judge according to his owne vnderstanding, it is a transgression *of pride*: and he may may be put to death for it: but the cheefe rulers and the high Priest not so: in them this is but a transgression *of errour*.

p Arb. Tur. Ior. dea. trac. cibod ab, sig. 241.

q Maimo. in Moreh Nebuchim lib. 3. perek. 42.

AGainst the sixt commandement, they give allowance of murder, divers wayes. They say, [r] if ten men do strike a man with ten staves, so that every one be sufficient to kill him, & he dy; whether they stroke him one after an other, or whether they stroke him together as one man, they are all free from being slaine by the court of judgement, because it is sayd every soule of a man which is one, if he kill, &c. They say, [s] whosoever goes in vnto a woman that is a gentile, (vnder vvhom they comprehend Christians) whether by vvay of mariage, or by way of fornication, if he do it manifestly in the sight of ten or moe Israelites, if they finde him and be zealous and kill him: behold

r R. Mosemikkotsi in SMG, in Loim, præcept. 163.

s Maimon. in Misneh, in Aisure Biah, cap. 12.

theſe are to be prayſed and preſerved: this is *halacah lemoſheh Miſsinai*, a tradition delivered vnto Moſes at Sinai: But if the zealous come to kill this man and he eſcape, and kill the zealous to deliver himſelf out of his hand, then is not he to be ſlaine for killing the zealous. In an other caſe they "hold it lavvfull to kill the Gentile that doth but ſtrike a Ievv, and for proof they alledge *Moſes* his example, *Exo.* 2.11.12. Againe they t teach, that if any of the Idolatrous gentiles (ſuch as they eſteeme Chriſtians to be) do fall into a pit, or into a place of danger, he that ſees them may not lift them or help them out, except they hyre him: even as they may not heale ſuch perſons but for a revvard, &c. But if they be heretiques, apoſtates, or the the like, ſuch as do leave their Iudaiſme and embrace Chriſtianitie, they hold it lawful to thruſt them downe with their hands viz. to drowne or kill them as occaſion is offred. And many other bloody doctrines are mainteyned by them.

" SMG. in Aſin, præc. 70.

t Arba Turim, l. Ioreh dea, in Abodah Zarah, fig. 158.

MOſt vaine alſo are the Rabbinicall doctrines touching mariage, tending many wayes to the violation of the 7th. Commandement: They ſay, u that every man is bound to take a wife, to encreaſe and multiply: that he which doth not mary, is as he that ſheddeth blood: and as he that defaceth the image of God: and that he cauſeth *Schecinah* or the maieſtie of God to depart from Iſrael: that whoſoever lives without a wife, lives without goodnes, without joy without bleſsing, without habitation, vvithout law, without wall, without peace, &. that ſuch an one is no man, &c. that the commandement of taking a vvife is exceeding great, becauſe they may not ſell the book of the law, but for to learne the law, and for to get a wife: that this commandement lyes vpon a man when he is 18. yeares old: that he may not paſſe 20 vvithout a wife: the diſciples of *R. Iſmael* ſay that vntill 20 yeares God ſtayes for a man that he may take a vvife: but if he paſſe 20 yeares without a wife, the holy bleſſed God ſaith, let the bones of that man be broken. *R. Aſher* ſaith if he paſſe 20 yeares without a wife, the houſe of judgement is to compell him to mary. Onely they have an ex-

u Arb. Tur. lib. Eben Ezer, in Aiſure Biah, fig. 1.

exception for ſtudents as *ben Azzai* that made the law his wife, &c. If a man have had a wife and Children by her in his youth, he muſt alſo as *R. Iehoſhua* ſaith take one in his age: and ſo to prove that a man may not live a vvidower they alledge that ſaying of Solomon, *Eccl.* 11. 6. If a man have liued vvith a vvife 10. yeares & ſhe have brought him no Children, they ſay he is bound to put her away, that he may fulfill the commandement, *encreaſe and multiply*. Further, that a man is to take many wives to encreaſe and multiply: but the counſell of their wiſeſt men is that a man ſhould have but 4 wives that he may the better pleaſe them: that yet if they live in ſuch places where the law allowes them to take but one wife (as here in Chriſtendome) they are then to follow the cuſtome. Beſides this as they have many canons touching mariage vnmeet to be mentioned, ſo they w have allowance of ſome practiſes which are monſtrous and againſt nature not to be named. And wo to them that fetch the expoſition of Gods law from ſuch practiſes as are recorded by theſe Rabbines.

w Eben Ezer in Aiſure Biah, fig. 24.

Againe, they teach that x every Preiſt whether high Prieſt or other inferiour prieſt that takes one of the three women (either harlot, or divorced or polluted) and ſhall marie her, he is to be puniſhed: but if he go in vnto her after the maner of an harlot, he is not to be puniſhed: becauſe it is ſayd, *he ſhall not take:* vntill he take and mary her, &c. But if the high Prieſt go in vnto a widow (after the maner of a harlot) he is puniſhed once: if he mary her, he is to have double puniſhmēt, &c. They teach y alſo, that he which goes in vnto a deafe vvoman; to a mad woman: to a perſon that is *Tomtom*, i. in reſpect of certaine knowledge neither male nor female: to an Hermaphrodite that is both male and female, &c. that all theſe are free, if preſumption be not added. Their other vaine traditions concerning women, wives and maydes are innumerable.

x Maimony in Aiſure Biah, c. 17. ſect. 2, & 3.

y Ibidem cap. 3.

OF their falſe expoſitions of the eight commandement, there is alſo a great number. Their Thalmudique ca-

nons require a man to restore the thing lost by an Israelite, but [z] if they finde a thing lost by an heretique, an Epicure, an Idolater and such as openly pollute the Sabath, they give men liberty not to restore vnto them the thing lost by them, &c. If [a] a theefe dig through and break into the house of a man and steale away his goods, they do not require restitution in this case as in other thefts, because the theefe herein adventured his life, and it had bene lawfull to have killed him if he had bene taken in the fact. And [b] such a kind of excuse they have to free him that stealeth vpon the Sabath day. If a theefe [c] steale a thing and sell it, and an other theef come and steale it: the first theef is to restore 4 or 5- fold: the second is required to restore double if he stole it after the owners thereof despayred to finde it: but if he stole it before they despayred to find it againe, then is he free from the double restitution, by their canons. They say, [d] if a man steale any thing from a gentile, from any that is not an Israelite, or if he steale the treasures of the sanctuary he is freed from restoring double, because it is sayd he shall restore double *vnto his neighbour*, &c. Touching receyving of almes, [e] their canons are, that a man which hath meate for two meales may not receive any thing from their *Tamchavi*, the common dish, or almes-basket: if a man have meate for fourteene meales, he may not receive any thing from their *Kopheh*, the common purse or poore mans Boxe: if a man have two hundred peeces of that money, which they call *Zuz*, (commôly reckoned to be the fourth part of a shekel,) though he do not traffique with them: or if he have fifty of those peeces, and do traffique with them, then may he receyve no almes at all: if a man have two hundred of those peeces of money, wanting a peny or a *dinar*: though any would give him a thousand more of those same peeces at one time, behold he may then receyve them all: Or if a man have a house and much houshold stuffe, and have not these two hundred peeces of money, he may still receive & need not sell his houshold stuffe, though they be vessels of silver & vessels of gold, &c.

[z] R. Moses mikkotsi SMG. in Asin. præc. 74.
[a] Thalmud Sanhedrin, c. 8. fo. 72.
[b] Choshen hamishpat, in Genibah, sig. 351.
[c] Ibidem, sig. 350.
[d] SMG, in Asin, præc. 71.
[e] Ioreh dea. tract. Tsedakah, sig. 253.

Against

AGainst the truth and lawfull vvitnessing thereof, taught in the 9th. commandement; they bring divers glosses to pervert the same. They [f] allow a man in many cases to break his word and his promise: and divers instances hereof are alledged by them, in such bargaines or agreements, wherein they have promised to give vnto an other more then he deserves, & then is convenient for him. VVhen many give testimony concerning one matter, if there be [g] one of the witnesses that be a Kinsman, or otherwise insufficient to beare witnesse; then they hold that the testimony of them all ceasseth, yea though they be an hunddred of them, yet their testimony is voyd. They hold [h] also that it is not lawfull for a man to joyne in testimony with a wicked man, although the wicked man be willing to witnesse the truth also. VVhen they [i] examine witnesses apart and ask them whether they went *to see* that thing, or *to be witnesses*: they hold, he that answers, *he went to be a witnesse* makes the whole testimony vnlawfull: he that answers, *he went to see*, doth not preiudice the testimony. Moreover [k] because it is sayd, the Fathers shall not be slaine for the children, nor the Children for the Fathers; they collect and conclude that fathers may not be put to death vpon the testimony of their Children: nor Children vpon the testimony of their Fathers. And many other such like canons they have concerning this matter.

[f] R. Moses mikkotsi in SMG. in Asin, præcep. 74.
[g] Choshen hammishpat in Eduth, sig. 36. & SMG, in Loim, præc. 213.
[h] Ibid. in Loim, præc. 214.
[i] Chosh. hammishpat, tract. Eduth, sig. 36.
[k] SMG. Loin, præc. 215.

COncerning the lust forbidden in the 10th. commandement the more ancient Rabbines have denyed the same to be any transgression of Gods law as appeares [l] by our Saviours refutation of their opinion therein: But divers of the [m] later Rabbines do acknowledge this concupiscence of the heart to be a sin and forbidden of God. The ancient Iew-doctours whom you vse most to commend, are herein most erroneous and greater corrupters of Gods law, then their successours. And how much more are we to reiect these Rabbinical traditions, when as the Rabbines themselves do begin to be weary and ashamed of them?

[l] Mat. 5. 22 28.
[m] Maimon. in Moreh Nebuchim chel. 3. perek. 34. & R. Moses mikko. in Loin, 158.

Thirdly,

THirdly, as for thoſe legal rites which (as you ſay) will not be well vnderſtood without help of Rabbines *eſpecially in Exodus & Leviticus:* The truth is that the Rabbines dote about nothing more then about them. This is evident by manifold examples: Among other legal Ordinances deſcribed in *Leviticus*, the *firſt* and the *tenth* day of the ſeventh moneth were appoynted to be kept holy, *Lev.*23.24.27. Of theſe dayes thus ſay the Rabbines; [n] Three bookes are opened in the beginning of the yeare, one *ſchel Tſadikim gemurim*, for thoſe that are perfectly juſt: an other *ſchel Reſchaghnim gemurim*, for thoſe that are perfectly wicked: a third *ſchel Benonijim*, for the midle ſort: The firſt ſort are then preſently written and ſealed vnto life: the ſecond ſort are preſently written and ſealed vnto death: the third ſort are ſuſpended and ſtand vntill the day of reconciliation, (for 10. dayes, from the firſt vnto the tenth day of the ſeventh moneth:) If in that meane time they do wel or merit, they are then vvritten into the book of life: if they do not merit, they are then written into the book of death. Herevpon they ſay, for ever a man muſt look to himſelf, when he is half pure, and half guilty: by one good work he may bring himſelf *lecaph zacuth* into the ſtate of purity; and by one tranſgreſſion he may bring himſelf *lecaph chobah*, into the ſtate of guiltines and be curſed for ever. Therfore they exhort to *ſeek the Lord while he may be found*, that is, the 10 dayes betwixt the beginning of the yeare, & the day of reconciliation. *The ſchoole of Schammai* [o] makes the ſame diſtinction of perſons for the day of judgement, & ſaith of the third ſort, the midle kinde, that being layd in the balance they go downe to hell: then they cry and come vp againe: and for proofe of this their going downe to hel for a while, they alledge divers ſcriptures, viz. *Zach.*13.9. 1 *Sam.*2.6. *Pſ.*116.1, &c. But *the ſchoole of Hillel* ſaith further of that third ſort: if they be of the ſinners of Iſrael they ſhall be twelve moneths in Hell, and after that be delivered: but as for heretiques, apoſtates, &c. thoſe go downe to hel for evermore. Againe where as God commanded in the levitical ordinances, that

[n] R. Alphes in Roſch haſſchanah Cap. 1. Fol. 303.

[o] R. Alcheſtoid. Fol. 304.

there ſhould be drink offrings of wine with certaine other ſacrifices; with theſe do the Rabbines teach drink offrings with vvater to be vſed at the feaſt of Tabernacles. The *Maſorites* for a note thereof, ſet this ſigne פמיס. *Elias Levita* expounding this mark ſhewes [q] that by the three numeral letters in *Bûz* are noted the ſecond, ſixt, and ſeventh dayes in the feaſt of Tabernacles, where in the deſcription of the drink offrings for thoſe three dayes, there is written in the Hebrew for the ſecond day *niſcehem* with *mem*: for the ſixt *neſaceha* with *jod* before the affix, and for the ſeventh day *cemiſhpatam* with *mem*, theſe three laſt letters yeelding the word *mayim* which ſignifyeth waters herevpon they collect and conclude that they had drink-offrings of water for thoſe three dayes as well as drink offrings of vvine, for the other 5. dayes of that feaſt which in their deſcription have ſtill *niſcah*, a drink offring without addition of *jod* or *mem*, *Numb.*29.16.--38. And this obſervation is alſo recorded in their Talmud from [r] *R. Iehudah ben Bathirah*, & from *R. Akiba*. If theſe be juſt and true expoſitions, who could have found them out or wel vnderſtood them without help of Rabbines?

[p] Maſorah ketannah *Ketanna* on Numb. 29. 19.

[q] Maſoreth hammaſoreth, in ſchibre Luchoth, ſive in fragmentis Tabularum.

[r] Taanith, c. 1. Fo. 2.

Againe, the obſervation of the Sabath is often commanded in *Exodus* and often in *Leviticus*: and ſee how wel they record the externall practiſe thereof in the common wealth of Iſrael: and what cauſe you have vpon ſuch records to cōmend their expoſitions vnto vs. They teach vs that it is a principall duety of the Sabath to make good cheare vpon that day: and to keep 3 feaſts in the ſame: at the beginning, middle & end therof. [x] *R. Ioſe* bleſſing himſelf ſaith, let my portion be vvith them that keep the three banquets of the Sabath. This they ſay is, [y] *to call the Sabath a delight. i. Oneg.* R. Iehudah, ſaith this *Oneg* or delight, is to have tartes, great fiſhes, and heads of garlick. To thoſe that thus delight themſelves on the Sabath, they apply that ſaying of David, *delight thyſelf in the Lord, and he ſhall give thee thine hearts deſire, pſ.*37.4. And for confirmation of this they tell vs many ſtrange ſtories: [a] *R. Chaia* telles of the houſholder that had a gol-

[x] Thalmud in Sabath c. 16. f. 118

[y] Eſa. 5 S. 13

[z] Thalmud ibid.

[a] Thalm. ibid. f. 119.

golden table with sixteene silver chaynes affixed therevnto, which sixteene men could scarsely cary; also that it was furnished with dishes, spoones, trenchers, pots, &c. & all this given him of God, because whensoever he found a good fat beast, he kept the same to honour the Sabath withall, by making good cheare. And because the word *Oneg*, or delight, in *Esa.* 58. doth want the letter *vau*, the numeral letter which standeth for *six*: hence they collect that they ought not to continue fasting on the Sabath above six houres: And for this they have [b] a Canon requiring great care herein least the delight of the Sabath should be violated; that they must make hast to end their prayers and service before midday, that they may then keep the second feast of the Sabath, &c. As for the works forbidden on the Sabath, they make them of two sorts, *Aboth melacoth*, & *Toledoth melacoth*, that is, Father or head workes, and the generations proceeding from them: and both sorts vnder great penalty are condemned by them: The head workes they reduce vnto 39. artickles: the offspring derived from these are a huge number. A head work forbidden is, to plow or till the ground: vnder this article they condemne all digging, filling of ditches, watring of herbes, &c. Therfore their Rabbines permit men to sprinckle, their houses or chambers vvith vvater, that the dust be not raysed, but forbid men to sweep with besomes: least in sweeping any clefts or holes like vnto lirle ditches should be filled vvith dust. A work forbidden is, cutting downe of corne, and reaping: vnder this article they comprise all plucking of apples, dates, figges, gathering of beries. And therfore they permit men to eat apples or other fruits, if they will put their mouthes vnto them as they hang vpon the tree: but with the hand to pluck away an apple from the tree or berie from the bush, that they vtterly condemne. Sowing corne on the Sabath is a head work forbidden: but vnder this also, they forbid men in giving of corne to hennes or the like creatures, to cast any more graines of corne vnto them then they vvill be sure to eate: for if any graines lighting vpon the earth where the raine falles,

[b] Arba Turim in Orach chajim, in Sabath, fig. 288.

[c] Thalmud Tract de Sabb. & Ioa. Buxt. in Synag. Iudaic. c. 11

falles, should hap to spring and grow, this should then prove a great sin, like to that of the husbandman that sowes his field on the Sabath day. To beare a burden vpon the Sabath is a capitall sin: and herevpon they forbid men to weare pattins vpon the Sabath, as the maner of some is that are to walk through myerie and foule places: their reason is, though these seeme to cary a man: yet indeed he beares the burden of them when he lifts vp his feete and goes with them.

Killing of beasts by butchers is vnlawfull on the Sabath: accordingly they teach that if a flea be found leaping on the earth or on clothes it is not lawfull to take it on the Sabath, but if the flea bite, then it is lawfull to take it to remoove it and cast it away, but not to kill it: but if it be a lowse that may be killed. Yet on the cõtrary side *R. Eliezer* teacheth that vvhosoever kills a lowse vpon the Sabath, doth as much as if he should kill a Camell. And herevpon touching the hunting of a flea there growes a great and subtile dispute among the Thalmudistes. The workes of artificers in their ordinary trades and callings being forbidden: thence they [d] say, we may not blow the fire with bellowes on the Sabath, because it representeth the vvork of an artificer; but through a hollow reed or cane men may lawfully do it. And in making a fire, great care is to be vsed that the stickes be not so layd, that they should cary shew of a building: That vvere vnlawfull, like the building of a house on the Sabath. Moreover there is great [e] controversy betwixt the schoole of *Hillel* and *Schammai* touching the egge that is layd vpon a a good day. And some of them [f] say, that it is vnlawfull to touch an egge that is layd vpon a good day, and consequently that it is much more vnlawfull to eat the same: yea if they be vncertaine vvhen the egge vvas layd and do but doubt whether it is layd on a good day or on a common day that it is then vnlawfull to be eaten: yea if such an egge be layd among a thousand other egges, that they cannot know it from the rest, that then they all become vnlawfull. Thus do the Rabbines record the externall practise of Moses ordinances in the com-

[d] Sebastian. Munster in Mat. 15.

[e] Thalmud in Beesah, or treat. of the egge. c. 1. fol 1.

[f] Seb. Münst. in Mat. 15.

mon wealth of Israel: thus do they help vs to vnderstand the observation of the Sabath and other legal rites: There is as much assurance of truth and right in these traditions as in others that you alledge from them: and I desire the reader to excuse me in the rehearsall of them, because the knowledge hereof helpes to refute your presumptuous assertion touching the help to be receaved from them. VVhen they have g pray... diligently on the Sabath, and in speciall have vttred that verse, *Then the heaven and the earth were finished & all the hoste of them: Gen. 2. 1.* The Rabbines tell vs, that then there be two Angelles one good, the other evill, which bring them home to their houses, and laying their hands vpon their head, do say, *Behold, this coale hath touched thy lippes; thine iniquity shalbe taken away and thy sin purged.* *R. Iose* saith, that there be two Angelles, the one good, the other evill, which every Sabath day in the evening do lead ech man from the Synagogue to their house: where if these Angelles do finde the Sabath-candle burning, the table spread, and the bed prepared, then the good Angel sayth; God grant, that the Sabath following, all things may be in this house so as now they are, wherevnto the evill Angell is constrayned to say *Amen*, whether he will or not. On the contrary, if these two Angelles coming to the house, do finde the former things vnprepared, then the evill Angell saith, let all things be in this house the next Sabath, as now they are: wherevnto the good Angell is compelled to say *Amen*, whether he will or not. The Rabbines say it is impossible for Christians and others to keep the Sabath as the Iewes do, because they want a soule which the Iewes have more then they. By vertue of this superfluous soule, they say that the heart of the Iewes is enlarged to reioyce and to be glad and hereby they banish all cares and troubles out of their breasts, and so keep the rest of the Sabath. This h soule as *R. Simeon ben Lakish* affirmeth is given them every week at the beginning of the Sabath and taken away at the end of the Sabath againe. This they also labour to prove by the scriptures, from the word of Moses, *Exo. 31. 17, and in the seventh day*

g Thalmud de Sabb. c. 16. f. 119 & Arba Turim in Orach Chajim trac. Schab sig. 262.

h Thalmud in Betsah c. 2. fol. 16 & Thalmud in Taanith c. 4. fol. 27

day he rested and was refreshed; schabbath vaijnnapheschi. VVhereas the men of the station appoynted 4. fastes in the week, to wit, on the, second, third, fourth, and fift dayes: on the second day for them that went downe to the Sea; on the third, for them that travelled in the wildernes: on the fourth, for litle children that the squinancie should not fall on them; on the fift, for women great with Childe, and for nurses that they should not let their sucklings fall: on the evening of the Sabath they fasted not, for honour of the Sabath, and much less vpon the Sabath it self: but on the first of the week: what is the reason? *R. Samuel bar Nachmani* saith, because that day is the third after their affliction; *Resch Lakish* saith, because of *neschamah iattirah*, the redundant Soule: for *Resch Lakish* saith, a redundant soule is giv̄e to man in the beginning of the Sabath and taken away in the going out of the Sabath, as it is sayd, *schabbath vaijnnapheschi:* streightway as he hath kept the Sabath that soule departeth or is lost. For this losse no marvel if they fasted the next day of the week. Againe, the Rabbines teach, that vpon the Sabath day the Soules in hell do rest from their torment: and their fire that vses to burne them all the week, ceasseth. They k say, that *Turnus Rophus* demanding what the Sabath day was above other dayes, *R. Akiba* answered him, that the excellency thereof above other dayes was proved by three things, by the river *Sambation*: by them that had familiar spirits: by his Fathers sepulchre, where the smoke did not ascend vpon the Sabath: And the Rabbinique l scholiast on the same place declares, how that river Sambation though it flow and run violently all the week yet rests on the Sabath day: how the spirits are not raysed on the Sabath day: how the soules in hell tormented and burned all the other dayes of the yeare, do yet rest on the Sabath: and that so accordingly the soule of this *Turnus* his Father being in hell, and the smoke of his burning ascending through his grave on other dayes, did yet ceasse on the Sabath. VVhen the Iewes have ended their prayers & concluded the Sabath, then comes an evill Angel called *Dumah* which commands them to re-

k Thalmud in Sanhedrin, c. 7. fol. 65.

l Glos. on Talm. ibid.

turne vnto their torment. Herevpon it is an ordinance & rite amõg the Iews that they may not quite empty any veſſels of the water in thẽ vpõ the Sabath, but alvvayes to leave ſome in, leaſt thoſe miſerable ſoules that are come out of hel for the ſpace of the Sabath, ſhould any where vvant vvater to coole and refreſh themſelves withall. And a thouſand ſuch like vaine obſervations are reteyned among them. On this maner (Mr. Ainſworth) do your ancient and later Iewes record the externall practiſes of Moſes ordinances: ſo that it is manifeſtly true which one ſayd, n *it doth as vvell become the Iew-doctours to expound the holy ſcripture, as it doth a vvild bore to dig a vineyard.*

m Ioa. Buxt. Synag. Iudaic. p. 253

n Buxt. ibid. p. 36.

Fourthly, To come yet neerer vnto you, tel vs what one legal rite there is vvhich could not be well vnderſtood without the Rabbines expoſition alledged by you in any part of your annotations: Name one if you can: Nay even ſuch Iewiſh records and expoſitions, as you yourſelf do pick out and preſent vnto vs as more worthy to be remembred then others: with which alſo you do adorne your book & paynt the face of your annotations: even thoſe alſo are ſo full of notorious abſurdities, preſumptions without ſcripture and apparant pervertings of the ſame, that by them it may eaſily be diſcerned what litle reaſon or warrant you had to ſay, that *many of thoſe legal rites eſpecially in Exodus and Leviticus, vvill not be vvel vnderſtood vvithout the help of the Rabbines.* For example,

Touching the divers geſtures in the vvorſhip of God, you a record, that the Hebrew-doctours in the *Zohar* do help vs thus to vnderſtand them: that *the bending of the head, vvith the face toward the ground, vvas for to eſcape judgement and the bowing of themſelves (or vvorſhipping,) vvas for to obtaine mercy: and that the bending of the head vvas before the vvorſhipping: according to the myſterie of the ſin offring before the burnt offring.* To illuſtrate this vaine diſtinction you alledge divers places of ſcripture to ſhew the order of the ſin-offring & burnt-offring: you might have done better to have alledged as many in refutation of this *Zohar*. Touching other externall practiſes in the Iewes common

a Annot. on Exo. 4. 31.

mon wealth: you tell vs from the Rabbinicall records, b *He that kicked his neighbour vvith his foote, payd five ſhekels: he that ſmote him vvith his thigh payd three ſhekels: he that bent his fiſt and ſmote him, payd thirteen ſhekels: if he ſmote him vvith the palme of his hand one ſhekel, &c.* Touching the neighbours gored **Ox**, you c note that the Hebrew doctours take it ſtrictly and ſay. *If an Iſraelites Oxe puſh an Ox ſanctified* (vnto God:) *or an Oxe that is ſanctified do puſh an Iſraelites oxe: he is not bound to pay* (by this law;) *for it is ſayd* his neighbours Oxe. Touching the law of fire kindled in ſtacks of corne, you d note, that the Hebrew Doctours explayn thus: *One brings fyre, an other* after *brings vvood: he that brings the vvood is bound to pay. One brings vvood, and then an other brings fyre: now he that brings the fire is bound to pay. If one come & make the flame, then he is bound to pay, &c.* Touching the kinde of vſury, you e ſhew vs this their expoſition: *It is vnlavvfull to take vſurie before or after. As, one intending to borrow of a man, ſends him a gift, to the end that he may lend vnto him: this is vſurie aforehand. Or, he hath borovved of a man, and payd him againe: and ſends him a gift for his money vvhich he had of him for nought: this is after vſurie. Who ſo boroweth of his neighbour, and vvas not vvont in former time to ſalute him firſt: it is vnlavvfull for him to ſalute him firſt, (&* I need not to ſay to praiſe him:) *for it is vvritten, Vſurie of any vvord (or thing) Deut. 23. 19. though they be but vvords they are vnlavvfull. Likevviſe it is vnlavvfull for the borower to learne his lẽder to read, &c. all the vvhile his money is in his hand, if he vvere not vvont to do it before: as it is ſayd, Vſurie of any thing:* And againe a litle after in the ſame place. *He that lends vnto his neighbour, may not reteyne his ſervant to do vvork for him, although the ſervant ſit ſtill and hath nothing to doe, &c.* Touching the law of firſt fruits, you f note that the Hebrew canons ſay, *They bring no firſt-fruits but of ſeven things, viz. of vvheat, and of barley, and of grapes, and of figs, and of pomgranates, and of olives and of dates. And if one bring other beſides theſe ſeven kindes, they are not ſanctifyed. They bring no firſt fruits of liquors, ſave of olives and grapes: if a man bring other liquors they are not receyved of him. There is no meaſure of firſt fruits*

b Annot. on Exo. 21. 19.

c Ibid. on verſ. 35.

d On Exo. 22. 16.

e Ibid. on verſ. 25.

f Ibid. on verſ. 29.

ſet

set by the law: but by the Doctours a man must separate one of sixtie. If the well vnderstanding of the legal rites do consist in such explications and interpretations as these: then will I yeeld vnto you that the ordinances of Moses will not be well vnderstood without the Rabbinicall records, as you would have it: I think no man alive would have arrived vnto these profound determinatiõs, nor ever have light vpon these expositions, except he had plowed with the Iewes heifer of the Thalmud. Touching the precept of keeping men farr from false matters, you g note, that from thẽce the Iewes have a rule, *A iudge that knoweth of his fellow, that he is a violent extortioner or a wicked man, it is vnlawful to be ioyned in society with him, as it is written*, from a word of falshood thou shalt be farr. *And so they in Ierusalem, that had a clear conscience were wont to doe: they sate not in iudgement, till they knew who should sit; nor sealed any writing, til they knevv who should seale it with them, &c.* If this rule were sound, then would it help much to the establishing of your separation and not onely of it: but of a further then you, I thinke, I will maintaine. Touching the fruits of the seventh yeare, you h note how it is shewed by the Hebrew records, that *whatsoever was properly mans meat, as wheat, figges, grapes and the like: they might not make of them medicine, plaisters, &c though for mans vse because it is sayd, To you for meat, Lev. 25. 6. & not for medicine, &c.* A number of these vaine traditions I observed before in setting downe your first scãdall in allegatiõ of the Thalmudists & many more such like might be also noted, wherein it may appeare how well the Rabbines vnderstood the external practise of the legall rites: yea I may justly say of these their expositions as yourself do of the k popes determinations. VVhereas men might have some good measure of light in these mysteries, by the plaine scriptures it is come to passe by these Rabbines and Thalmudique glosses, interpretations, comments, &c. that darknes and grosse darknes hath covered many people, who if they had never read any thing, but the book of God, mought have seen much more clearely, through his grace: l Their expo-

g Annot. on Exo. 23. 7.

h Ibid. on vers. 11.

k Answer to Iohn Anst. p. 65.

l P. 66. 67.

positiõs do often times as wel clear the truth, as a cloud before the sun. Yea even the plainest places, which in holy writ are as bright as noone day; these Thalmudists have enveloped with Egyptian darknes. Their expositions do illustrate the scriptures, as the smoke of the pit did the Sun and the aier *Apo 9 2.* So far wide are you, in saying that many legall rites vvill not be well vnderstood without their help. You once m sayd well: *The scriptures are not so bare and naked as to need the raggs of mens inventions to array them.* VVhy do you now then yourself so plod and labour to aray them with the menstruous rags of the Rabbines?

m Ibid. p. 21.

Fifstly, where as you n say further: *By their records also, many particulars about the Passeover, which Christ kept, Mat. 26. the phylacteries which the Pharisees wore, Mat. 23. and other things mentioned in the Evangelists, will much be cleared: whereof see the annotations on Exo. 12, & Exo. 13. 9.* Even these more speciall instances chosen out by you, do also plainely witnesse against you that the Thalmudique traditions do not so much cleare as darken and obscure the ordinances of God; and the story of the scriptures: As for your annotations on Exo. 12. touching their keeping of the passeover, which you desire vs to see: there vve see a number of superstitious traditions related by you, but not reproved by you as was meete: you o tell vs of their sauce *charoseth* a memoriall of the clay wherein they wrought in Egipt: you note the 4. *Cups of wine* which every man and woman was bound to drink that night vvithout faile: you note the measure of ech cup containing a quarter of a log, so much as an egge & a half: you note the severall blessings to be made for every cup by itself: you note their tradition of vvashing their hands twise that night, vvhereas other nights they do it but once: and their blessing for the vvashing of hands: that all other nights, they eate either sitting or lying: but this night, lying onely: you make relation also of a fift cup and the great hymn, that vvas sayd for it, viz. the psalme 136. But that they are not bound to this cup as to the foure former cups. And in fine, having related

n Preface to annot. on Gen.

o Annot. on Exo. 12. 8.

lated theſe and ſome other of their traditions, you ſay further; *Theſe obſervations of the Iewes vvhiles their common vvealth ſtood, & to this day: may give light to ſome particulars in the paſſeover that Chriſt kept: as vvhy they lay downe, one leaning on an others boſome, Ioh. 13.23. (a ſigne of reſt and ſecurity) and ſtood not as at the firſt paſſeover, neither ſate on high as vve vſe. Why Chriſt roſe from ſupper, and vvaſhed and ſate downe againe, Ioh. 13.4.5.12. Why he bleſſed or gave thanks for the bread apart, and for the cup (or vvine) apart, Mark. 14 22.23, and vvhy it is ſayd, he took the cup after ſupper, Luk. 22. 20. alſo concerning the Hymne vvhich they ſung at the end, Mat. 26. 30, &c.* But vve are here to conſider, that 1. It is vncertaine vvhether theſe vvere the obſervations of the Iewes vvhiles their common vvealth ſtood: The records of the Rabbines from vvhoſe mouth you ſpeak, are full of lyes, fictions, contradictions even for matters of fact and practiſe: and even for theſe particular obſervations here mentioned by you: if you deny it, I can bring you plentifull proof thereof: And how great folly is it, to ſtuff our expoſitions of the ſcripture with ſuch things as the conſcience can not be aſſured of the truth thereof? 2. Suppoſe the obſervations of the Iewes before Chriſte were ſuch as you in particular do relate: how vnworthily do you apply his holy inſtitution vnto their vaine inventions? Do you not make Chriſte Ieſus guilty of their ſuperſtitions and preſumptuous additions vnto the ordinance of God, as though framed himſelf vnto their vnlawfull practiſes and followed the ſame? The light you boaſt of, is darknes, and not light. Theſe things which the Rabbines record are not according to the law and the teſtimonie: & vvhiles they ſpeak not according to that vvord, vvhat light is in them? The maner of Chriſts ſitting downe with leaning vpō one an others boſome, was according to the cōmō & ordinary maner of their ſitting downe to meate at thoſe times as appeareth by the vſe of the q like phraſe ſerving to deſcribe the ſame: and therfore was directly contrary to the ſuperſtition of the Iewes, that all other nights did eat ſitting or lying, that night

p Eſa. 8. 20
q Mat. 9. 10, & 22, 10 11, & 26. 7. Mark. 16. 14. Luk. 7. 37. & 22, 27.

night lying onely: and therfore a ſuperſtitious bondage. As for Chriſts riſing from ſupper to vvaſh his diſciples feet: what cōmunity is there betwixt it & the ſuperſtitious hand-waſhing of the Iewes? If our Saviour r had no regard of the phariſaicall waſhing of hands at other times; much leſſe had he regard to this invention in the worſhip of God and celebration of this ſacrament: yea it is impiety to think that he followed their faſhion either in this or in any of the like traditions. 3. The obſervations of the Iewes in keeping their paſſeover, according to the records of the Rabbines are ten times more then theſe that you have repeated: and they are of like nature, of like warrant and authoritye, even from their owne braines: you might as vvel have repeated them alſo: as namely, The myſterie of the ſ three cakes covered betwixt two napkins in a diſh; one which was higheſt repreſenting the high Prieſt: the middle moſt repreſenting the tribe of Levi: & the loweſt repreſenting the whole people of Iſrael: a myſterie as worthy to be noted as that which you mention of the 4. cups, &c. You might as wel have related the myſterie of their quiſhions then ſometimes leaned vpon, ſometimes not: their hiding of a peece of a cake vnder a napkin, to ſignify how their elders coming out of Egipt caried their dough vpon their ſhoulders bound in clothes, &c. Some other of theſe traditions I noted before, in deſcribing their Idol-temple; and many more if need requite may be brought forth for a teſtimony, how far they were from the right externall practiſe of Moſes his ordinances. As for your notes vpon that t other place, which you ſend vs to look vpon touching the Phylacteries: 1. vve finde there ſo much ſuperſtition and vanitie recorded by yourſelf out of the Rabbines touching the maner, order, time and fruit of them, as may juſtly ſerve to reprove your owne aſſertion, touching the neceſſary help of ſuch recorders: It is wonder, that you beholding and conſidering their groſſe corrupting of Moſes ordinances in the externall practiſe thereof, are not yet aſhamed to affirme that many legall rites will not be well vnderſtood without their

r Mat. 15. 2, &c.

ſ Arba Turim in Orach Chajim, fig. 473, &c

t Annot. on Exo. 15 9.

help. 2. I finde, by comparing your notes with the Iewes records, that you do yet omit the u greateſt part of the moſt ſuperſtitious obſervations which thoſe magical Rabbines and charmers do record touching thoſe phylacteries: as namely, the qualitie of the parchment whereon they wrote the ſentences of ſcripture: the colour of the ynk, and the matter of the ynk wherewith they were written: the colour of the lether into which they were put: the qualitie of the beaſt of whoſe ſkin that lether was made; the quality & cōdition of the mā that muſt kill that beaſt: The condition of the Tanner that muſt dreſſe that lether the qualitie of thoſe perſons that might weare thoſe phylacteries; the qualitie of the place where they muſt be kept when they were layd aſide: the maner of their penance and faſting if they had let them fall to the ground: the curious x maner of the knots they make in tying and binding them, ſo that the letters of the vvord *ſchaddai*, which is one of the names of God be repreſented and figured out therein. Theſe and many other ſuch things they y hold to be divine traditions delivered of God vnto Moſes in mount Sinai when the Lord ſhewed his hinder parts vnto him. If Chriſtian men did ſee the volumes of doūges which the Thalmudiſts have written touching theſe phylacteries, they might thereby learne to beware of following you to ſeek the well vnderſtanding of Gods ordinances from ſuch blinde guides. But this I obſerve throughout your allegatiō of the Rabbbines that to win the more credit vnto your owne notes, you conceale the groſſeſt abſurdities of them; like the deceitfull merchant that to vent his wares conceales the greateſt faults thereof: Thus, the ſimple may be deceyved by you both. 3, that the place of the Evangeliſts Mar. 23, touching the phylacteries which the Phariſees vvore, ſhould much be cleared by theſe Rabbinical records, as you pretend, it is but a bare aſſertion. VVherein is the text cleared? In what poynt may we better vnderſtand the words of our Saviour? And what is it in the rebuke of the phariſees which we could not as clearely vnderſtand, without help of the Rabbines? vve may not meaſure nor

a Arba Turim in Orach Chaijm, trac. tephil. ſig. 25, &c.

y Thalmud in Berachoth cap. 8. p. 7.

nor judge of the Phariſaical traditiōs obſerved in Chriſts time, by the records of the Rabbines vvhom you alledge: becauſe the Thalmudique traditions recorded by theſe Rabbines are many of them of later invention, and far different from the traditions obſerved heretofore in Chriſts time. For vvhereas z the Phariſees of old, if a ſheep, ox or aſſe fell into a pit vpon the Sabath day, would allow the ſame ſtraighway to be lift vp & taken out on the Sabath; the a Thalmud allovves it not, but onely allowes meat to be given vnto the beaſt in the vvater; or if the water be deep, that bottles of ſtravv or ſuch like things be put vnder the beaſt to ſave it from drovvning. *R. Iulius Otto* a Ievv converted vnto Chriſtianiſme, in his book entitled the *brevelation of ſecrets* ſhevves many parables recorded in the Thalmud, vvhich the Rabbines (as it ſeemes) have had out of the Goſpel, though corruptly ſet downe by them: for how it can be ſhewed, that Chriſte hath taken ought out the Thalmud, which was compiled long after his death, and ſtuffed with new invented traditions of the infidel and reprobate Rabbines, accurſed for reiecting of the ſonne of God; And what is the Thalmud but even the black darknes, and the c vtter darknes into which the Iewes are now caſt? And what light is to be expected from ſuch a helliſh dungeon, where we may ſee the Rabbines, ſitting faſt bound in the chaynes of ignorance, ſuperſtition, infidelity and blaſphemy? How dare you ſay, that ſome parts of the ſcripture will not be well vnderſtood: vnleſs we become ſchollers in that accurſed ſchoole?

z Mat. 12. 11, & Luk. 14. 5.

a Thalmud de Sabbat. c. 18. p. 128.

b Gali Razia lib. 1. c. 13.

c Mat. 8. 12.

Sixthly, how can we expect any great light from the expoſitions of the Rabbines, when as they profeſſe that they may not commit the ſecrets of their law vnto vs: yea they make it matter of death and condemnation to reveale the ſame vnto vs; that for ſuch d cauſe they ſhould go downe to hell with greeſe, and be devoured with the fire that is not blowne. They may not teach them but onely to Iſraelites, and thoſe alſo having the five conditions which they obſerve from Eſa. 3. And further as your *Rambam or Maimony* ſaith, when they do teach the

d Elias Levita Maſor. hammaſor. prafat. 2.

Iſraelites ſo qualifyed, yet it muſt not be by writing, [c] *but from mouth to mouth*. Or at leaſt if they expoūd the ſecrets of their law in writing, it muſt be ſo obſcurely and darkely that none but their owne Schollers and frends can vnderſtand: and ſo *Maimony* in the ſame place profeſſeth vnto his ſpeciall frend & ſcholler touching his owne writing to him: as *Ariſtotle* once ſayd of his writings, vnto *Alexander*; that they were to be vnderſtood of thē onely that had bene hearers of him. Hence it is that in the Iewiſh writings there are many ambiguities: and many things ſpoken according to receyved opinions, when they have yet an other meaning: *Maimony* iu *Miſneh* (as he is [f] alledged by you) teaches that there be 9 ſpheres, namely, one for ech of the ſeven planets, one that hath in it all the other ſtarres which are ſeene in the firmament: and a ninth ſphere which turneth about every day from eaſt to weſt, &c. But in other later writings, he [g] laboureth at large to ſhew according to the demōſtrations of *Abubacus* that there are but *foure ſpheres*, to wit, *the ſphere of the fixed ſtarres; one ſphere for five planets: the ſphere of the Sun: and the ſphere of the Moone*; And theſe according to the number of the elemēts: that the ſphere of the moone moveth the element of water, that the ſphere of the Sun moveth the elemēt of fire: that the ſphere of the five planets mooveth the ayer: & that the multitude & varietie of their motions in that ſphere in their retrogradatiōs, progreſſions & ſtations cauſeth the change of the ayre and wether: that the ſphere of the fixed ſtarres, changeth the earth, &c. Theſe things he ſeekes to illuſtrate by the ladder on which the Angelles aſcended and diſcended: by the 4. ſtepps of that ladder, and the 4. Angelles, two aſcending and two diſcending and meeting together vpon one ſtep, &c. likewiſe by the 4 Chariots in Zacharie, coming out from betwixt the mountaines of braſſe, &c. Hereby it appeares what vncertainty there is in ſuch writings where they do purpoſely obſcure and hide their meanings: like charmers they do obſcurely [h] mumble and whiſper out of the duſt: and their talke is as of one that hath the ſpirit of divination, a hollow voyce, loth to be heard, or vnder-

[c] Moreh nebuchim chel. 3. per. 1. ex edit. Iuſtinian.

[f] Apnot. on Gen. 1. 17.

[g] Mo. ne-buch. chel. 2. perek. 10, & 11.

[h] Iſa. 29. 4.

vnderſtood. A man may ſay of the Rabbines myſtical doctrine, as themſelves do write of *Moſes his ſepulchre*, which they *reckon for one of thoſe ten things which they ſay were created in the beginning of the world, in the evening of the Sabath on the ſixt day: of this ſepulchre they " write whē ſome wēt to ſee it: when they ſtood above in a high place, they ſaw it as if it were below: vvhen they ſtood below, they ſaw it as if it were above: when this company devided themſelves, half of them that went below ſaw it over againſt them that vvere above: and the other half that ſtood above ſavv it as if it vvere over againſt them belovv. So doth the meaning of the Rabbines vaniſh and fly avvay from them that ſeek after ſome of their myſteries: To followv after them is to graſp after a ſhadovv.

*R. Solom. on Deut. 34. 6.

" Iſaak ben Arama in Akedath Iſaak, portâ, 105.

Laſtly, if it were true vvhich the Rabbines and your *Maimony* in ſpeciall doth vvrite touching the cauſe of prophecy ceaſſing, and the ſpirit of vnderſtanding vvithdravvne from men, then ſhould there be no reaſon to ſeek the right vnderſtanding of the ſcriptures from them. *Maimony* [i] records that the cauſe is affliction and greefe: becauſe the imaginative faculty is vveakned thereby: that the ſpirit of prophecy reſts not vpon an afflicted ſorovvfull man: that prophecy is taken avvay in the time of anger & anguiſh: that therfore *Iaacob* prophecied not all the dayes of his ſorovv becauſe his imaginative povver laboured about mourning for *Ioſeph*: that prophecy reſted not on *Moſes* after the ſending of the ſpies as it did before, vntill all that generation vvas conſumed: becauſe he vvas greeved for their evilles, &c. that this ſorovv and greefe is the next cauſe of prophecy departing in time of captivitie and diſperſion, &c. that this is it vvhich vvas ſayd by the prophet *they ſhalbe diſperſed or ſcattred, to ſeek the vvord of the Lord and ſhall not finde it*: & againe, *Their King and their prince is among the nations, there is no law, neither have the prophets found out the prophecy of the Lord.* So *Kimchi* " expounds the vvords of David, that he *lay downe and ſlept*, viz. vvhen by *Cuſhi* he heard the ſorovvfull tidings: that then the ſpirit of prophecy ceaſed in him, becauſe it reſts not on a

[i] Moreh nebuchim chelek. 2. perek. 37.

" Comment. on Pſ. 3.

on a ſorowfull perſon : that when *Nathan* came to him with good and joyfull matter, then *he awoke and roſe againe*, then the ſpirit came againe vnto him. Thus their owne words and writings are againſt thēſelves: & according to the ſame, they being now ſcattred abroad, and their preſent diſperſion being a moſt greevous captivitie vnto them, as they every where call it, the law is not among them, the word of God is not to be found among them: The ſpirit of the holy prophets and of good vnderſtanding is departed from them: And therfore their help to vnderſtand the ordinances of Moſes ſhould not be thought ſo neceſſary as you vvould perſwade vs.

CHAP. VII.

Our ſeventh errour and ſcandall in alledging the Rabbines is; that you approve and juſtify their preſumptuous expoſitions of Moſes, which they vainely and boldly affirme vvithout the vvarrāt of the ſcripture. It was great preſumption in you to ſay that many legal rites could not be well vnderſtood without their help: yea although their expoſitions had bene good and ſound: for other men endued with the ſpirit of vviſedome might have brought in like maner as good and ſound expoſitions as they: but when you juſtify their rotten and vnſound traditions, this is an other evill. To give inſtance in ſuch an expoſition as you do much inſiſt vpon, and deſcribe largely with tables, as being a flouriſhing ornament of your annotations; Touching the names of the tribes engraven vpon the ſtones, *according to their birthes*: you expound it [k] *or generations by their mothers: firſt all Leahs Children, (as Moſes himſelf reckoneth them Exo. 1. verſ 2, 3.) and then the other mothers Children and Rachels laſt: as ſhall after be more fully ſhewed, in their ſeveral ſtones; verſ. 17, &c.* This is a mere preſuming to vnderſtand above that vvhich is vvritten, contrary to that reverence and ſobriety vvhich God requires: for 1, who hath told you or what *Bath-*

[k] Annot. on Exo. 28. 10.

Bath-kol hath rung it in your eares, that all *Leahs* Children were firſt in the ſtones according to their naming in Exod. 1. rather then according to the reckoning which Moſes himſelf makes of them by their birthes Gen. 29. & 30. Secondly, if you will have all *Leahs* Children togather, though ſome of them by birth vvere yonger then the ſonnes of the handmayds, as in *Exod. 1.* VVhy do you not in like maner ſet *Beniamin* before the ſonnes of the handmayds as in the ſame place is done *Exod. 1. 3. 4.* which gives as much vvarrant for one as for the other?

But while ſcripture fayles you, you bring in *Maimony* for your help, to give ſome authoritie & ſhew vnto your expoſition, & ſay; Of this alſo Maimony writeth, impl. of ſanct. c. 9. ſ. 9. *He ſet on ech ſhoulder, a Beryll ſtone, foureſquare, emboſſed in gold: and he graved on the two ſtones, the names of the tribes, ſix on one ſtone, & ſix on an other, according to their birthes: & they wrote Ioſephs name Ihoſeph* (as he is written in pſal. 81. 6.) *So there were 25. letters on the one ſtone and 25. on the other. And the ſtone whereon Reuben was written, was on the right ſhoulder: and the ſtone that Simeon was written on, was on the left*, after the maner here ſet downe.

Reuben	ראובן
Levi	לוי
Iſſachar	יששכר
Naphtali	נפתלי
Gad	גד
Ihoſeph	יהוסף

Symeon	שמעון
Ihudah	יהודה
Zebulun	זבולן
Dan	דן
Aſher	אשר
Beniamin	בנימן

Touching this teſtimony and table of *Maimony*, I anſwer:

First, it is composed of many presumptions without warrat of scripture: and namely these, 1. That *Iosephs* name in this place should be vvritten with *H*, and withall such a distribution of their names that ech of the stones might have just 25 letters vpon them: a cabalisticall fancy: 2, that *Symeon* was written on the left shoulder as in the table: and not with *Reuben* on the same stone: as also the separating of *Ioseph and Beniamin* & not setting them on the same stone: and some other of them in like maner also: 3. The vnequall setting of the handmayds Children in the middes neither perfectly according to the time of their birth whiles Issachar and Zebulun are set before Dan and Naphtali nor according to the dignity of the Mothers, while *Rachels* sonnes are placed after the handmayds: 4, the placing of *Naphtali* before *Dan* his elder Brother, being both sonnes of the same mother, of Bilhah the handmayde: In all these
1 Col. 2. 18 your *Rambam* l hath vniustly advanced himself in those things which he never saw, rashly puft vp of the minde of his flesh, & was not taught of God in the scriptures. Such curious and light bladders of presumption blowne vp with the breath of blinde and infidel Rabbines ought not to be admitted of you, neither are they to be tolerated of any Christians.

Secondly, to come vnto the Rabbines themselves if any weight vvere in them, they also in this matter are rather against you then for you: though all of them to lay them vpon the balance are lighter then vanitie: 1. *R. Solomon Iarchi* more ancient then your *Maimony*, sets downe an other order of their
m Cõment. on Exo. 28 10. names in his exposition of this place: he m explaneth, *according to their birthes: according to the order wherin they were borne, Reubē, Symeon, Levi and Iudah, Dan and Naphtali vpon one* stone: *& vpon the second Gad and Asher, Issachar and Zebulun, Ioseph & Beniamin full* (that is, written with two iods) *becauſe so he is written in*
n Gen. 35. 18. *the* n *place of his birth, 25 letters vpon ech stone*: after the maner here set downe.

This

ראובן	*Reuben*
שמעון	*Symeon*
לוי	*Levi*
יהודה	*Iudah*
דן	*Dan*
נפתלי	*Naphtali*

Gad	גד
Asher	אשר
Issachar	יששכר
Zebulun	זבולן
Ioseph	יוסף
Beniamin	בנימין

This exposition of *R. Solomon* though it have a vaine respect to the equal number of letters on ech stone, yet is it far mote agreeable to the simplicity of the scriptures then that of *Maimony*, being free from those 4. vnwarrantable presumptions delivered by him. VVhy do you take the worse and leave the better? 2. *R. Moses Kotsensis* o also as he relates the exposition of *Maimony*, so doth he also set downe the interpretation of *R. Solomon* and doth not determine the ordering of the stones by *Maimony* to be more just and vvarrantable, then the order declared by *Iarchi*. 3. VVhen there is speech in the Thalmud of the distribution of the 12. tribes, 6 vpon mount *Gerizim* to blesse and 6 vpon mount *Ebal* to curse: it is thus recorded there p *R. Cahana saith, as they are divided here, so were they divided in the stones of the Ephod, &c.* Now the division of them vpon the two mountaines was thus: on *Gerizim* stood, q *Simeon, Levi, Iudah, Issachar, Ioseph, Beniamin*: on *Ebal* stood, *Reuben, Gad, Asher, Zebulun, Dan & Naphtali*: This order of the two hilles contradicts your order of the two stones: Againe in the same text of the Thalmud it is noted that the names of the tribes *vpon the second stone were according to their birthes, but not on the first, becauſe Iudah was there placed formost.* Thus they expounded

o Sepher mitsvoth haggadol. trac. vessels of sanct. præcept. affirmat. 173.

p Thalmud in Sotah cap. 7. f 36.

q Deut. 27 12. 13.

Exod. 28.18. referring thoſe vvords, *according to their birthes*, vnto the latter clauſe of the verſe onely, and not vnto the former part. 4. in the ſame tractate it is recorded that *R. Hanina the ſonne of Gamaliel ſayd*, the names of the tribes *are not diſtributed in the ſtones of the Ephod according to the order of the diſtribution in the book of numbers, but according to the order in the book of Exod. to wit, the ſonnes of Leah according to their order: the ſonnes of Rachel one of this ſide an other of that: and the ſonnes of the handmaydes in the middes.* This teſtimonie is very corruptly and imperfectly alledged by Mr. *Broughton*, and yet after he hath perverted the ſame, he ſaith vainely, *this note of the Thalmud endeth this controverſie*: and againe in the margine he poynts at it and calles it, *an exquiſite note for a tranſlatour*: vvhereas if there be any weight in that teſtimonie (as there is not, it being a mere preſumptiō) thē doth it plainely refute both his opiniō, & yours that without judgement follow him too much, in this matter of ordering the ſtones: for if the ſonnes of the handmaydes were placed in the middes betwixt the ſonnes of Rachel as in *Exo.* 1.3.--5. on this maner, *Beniamin, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, Aſcher, Ioſeph*, as R. Hanina would have, then are both your deſcriptions falſe, being different from this order.

z Thalmud in Sotah c. 7. Fol. 36. A. B.

r Adverti-ſement. of corruptiōs N. 1.

5. *R. Iohanan* in that gloſſe vpon the Thalmud which hath this title affixed, **Thorah or*, ſaith, *Beniamin was half vpon this ſide, to wit, vpon the ſecond ſtone, where the names were written according to the order on mount Ebal*, Ben; *and vpon the firſt ſtone*, jamin. In the gloſſe vpon the other ſide of the Thalmud, it is againe noted how *Iehudah* vvas placed firſt among the ſtones. 6. For a further proof of the lightnes and inſufficiency of theſe Rabbinicall expoſitions and preſumptions, conſider but the vanities that are recorded in the ſame leafe of the Thalmud above noted: ſpeaking of the t altar vpon the ſtones vvhereof God had commanded them to vvrite his law, they record, that *the law was vvritten vpon the ſtones of the altar in 70. languages: as it is ſayd, vvell and plainely, &c.* They ſay there alſo, The hornet paſſed not over with them: but is it not vvritten, u *I vvill ſend the hornet*

*Lex lux. gloſſ. on Sota vbi ſupra.

t Deut. 27. 5. 7.

u Exo. 23.

hornet before thee? *R. Simeon ben Lakiſh* ſaith, at the brink of Iorden the hornet ſtood and ſprinkled bitternes or gall vpon them, and blinded their eyes above, and made them eunuches below, as it is ſayd, x I deſtroyed the Amorites before them, whoſe height was like the height of Cedars, and he vvas ſtrong as the okes: notvvithſtanding I deſtroyed his fruit from above and his root from beneath. *R. Papa* ſaith, there vvere tvvo hornets one for *Moſes* and one for *Ioſhuah*; that of *Moſes* paſſed not over, but that of *Ioſhua* did go over. There alſo they write how the Angel *Gabriel* taught the 70. languages vnto Ioſeph: with other ſuch like fictions. Let ſober men take heed how they build any of their opinions vpon ſuch preſumptuous expoſitours as theſe be: let not men ſeek for order among the ſonnes of confuſion that dwell in the ſhadow of death, where there is no order, but their light is as darknes itſelf.

x Amos. 2.

A Gainē, touching the order of the Tribes names vpon the ſtones of the Breaſt-plate, you note thus. y *And here the Greek tranſlation addeth*, according to their generatiōs (*or* birthes) *as was expreſſed in the tenth verſe, and is here againe implyed. For in the ſame order that they were graven vpon the Berylles, were they here ſet and graven vpon twelve ſeverall ſtones: as they are here ſet down in the Page following.*

y Annot. on Exo. 28.21.

Vpon the	1 *Sardine.*	*was graven*	1 *Reuben.*	*Sonns of Lea.*
	2 *Topaze.*		2 *Symeon.*	
	3 *Smaragd.*		3 *Levi.*	
	4 *Chalcedonie.*		4 *Iudah.*	
	5 *Saphir.*		5 *Iſſachar.*	
	6 *Sardonyx.*		6 *Zabulon.*	
	7 *Hyacinth.*		7 *Dan.*	*Of Bilha, Rachels mayd*
	8 *Chryſopraſe.*		8 *Naphtali.*	
	9 *Amethyſt.*		9 *Gad.*	*Of Zelpha, Leahs mayd*
	10 *Chryſolite.*		10 *Aſer.*	
	11 *Beryll.*		11. *Ioſeph.*	*Of Rachel.*
	12. *Iaſper*		12 *Beniamin*	

Herevnto I anſwer, 1. The names of the tribes are often deſcribed vnto vs expreſſely and plainely: many times [z] before and many times [a] after this place in Exodus, but never according to this order which you imagine here: alwayes ſome difference is obſerved more or leſſe. And what preſumption is this, without warrant of ſcripture revealed to apply the names vnto the ſtones, contrary vnto the order of reckoning the tribes in every place? vvhat modeſt Chriſtian dare imitate you here: in?

[z] Gen. 29. with 30. ch. & 35. 23.--26. & 45.8.--24. & 49.3-27

[a] Exod. 1. 2. 3, &c. Numb. 1. 5.--42. & 2.3.--29. & 7.12.--78. & 10. 14.--27. & 13.5.--16. & 26. 5. 48. Deut. 27. 12. 13. & 33.6.--24. 1 Chro. 2. 1. 2. Rev. 7.5-8

2. VVhereas you tell vs that the Greek ttanſlation addeth, *according to their generations*: I have ſhewed before that the greek tranſlation which you alledge ſo oft in vaine, is a moſt corrupt, aud forged thing abounding with many vnlawfull & preſum ptuous additions, ſubtractions and alterations of the holy text, and therfore we ought not to build expoſitions ſo boldly vpon the credit and authority of ſuch a falſe and deceavable tranſlation.

3. Suppoſe it had bene expreſſed in the text, that the names of the tribes: had bene engraven vpon theſe ſtones according to their generations: yet doth it not follow that they ſhould be engraven according to the order, which you do here ſo peremptorily avouch and demonſtrate in this table; for if the order according to the time of their birth be preciſely followed, then are they to be reckoned as in *Gen. 29, & 30*, and then ſhould the Children of the handmayds be ſet before Iſſachar & Zabulon, contrary to this your order: if the time of their birthes be followed in ſome part and meaſure, yet ſo as reſpect be had vnto the dignity of Leah and Rachel above their maydes, then might the order of *Gen. 35, or Gen. 46*, have bene followed: which both are alſo contrary vnto this your order; neither of them leaving Beniamin to the laſt place, as you doe. Chriſtian humilitye and ſhamefaſtnes ſhould have taught you to have ſuſpended your judgement hererein, & not to have intruded your ſelf into ſuch things as God hath not manifeſted vnto you.

But for the eſtabliſhing of this your aſſertion, you tell vs in the

the ſame [b] place, that *This order of names is before ſhewed out of the Ieruſalemy Thargum*: The teſtimony of this Thargum you propound vnto vs and very carefully ſet before our eyes [c] foure ſeverall times according to the four parts of it: you miniſe it as if it were *Manna* or ſome angells food to feaſt vs therewith and to inſtruct vs concerning the four rewes of ſtones; And this is that teſtimony which *Mr. Broughton* alſo hath in like maner [d] alledged to the ſame purpoſe.

[b] Annot. on Exo. 28. 21.

[c] Ibid. on verſ. 17. 18 19. & 20.

[d] Advertiſement of corruptiõs N. 1.

Herevnto I anſwer, 1. The teſtimony of this fabulous writing is of no worth, being full of vnwarrantable preſumptions, fables, errours and moſt groſſe abſurdities. In the firſt ſection of Geneſis, this Thargum ſaith, that *Two thouſand yeares before the World was created, God created the law, and prepared Hell and the garden of Eden, &c.* On *Exod. 1.* this Thargum ſaith of *Shiphrah* the midwife, that ſhe was *Iochebed*; and of *Puah*, that ſhe vvas *Miriam*; that theſe women fearing God got them a good name in the reſt of the generations, and built them houſes, *the houſe of the Levites, and the houſe of the great Prieſthood*: This Ieruſalem paraphraſt on *Gen. 32.* confirmes the fable of Eſaw his biting Iaakob by the neck, as was noted before, and ſaith that both wept, *Eſaw* becauſe his teeth vvere ſet on edge, and *Iaakob* becauſe his neck was become Marble. This ſame Thargum on *Deut. 33.* telleth vs, how the glory of God vvas revealed on Mount *Seir* to give the law to the ſonnes of *Eſaw*: but when they found written therein *ye ſhall not kill*, they vvould not receave it. That then this glory ſhined on the mount of the border, to deliver this law vnto the ſonns of *Iſmael*: but vvhē they found vvritten therein *ye ſhall not ſteale*, they would not receive it. That then the glory of God returned and vvas revealed on mount *Sinai* with millions of holy Angels: That then *Iſrael* ſayd, whatſoever the vvord of the Lord ſaith, we vvill do it and will receyve it, &c. And with a multitude of ſuch like fabulous matters is that Thargum full ſtuffed: when you feed your readers with allegations of ſuch authors, you may fill their bellies with gravel and aſhes, and choake them in ſtead of nouriſhing them.

them. And a heap of ſuch vanities are in the ſame, which ſhew the vnſoundnes thereof.

2. Even in that very place which you alledge is there apparant and manifeſt errour in expounding the ſtones of the breaſt plate: and to omit others, this is to be obſerved in the two laſt ſtones, which this Thargum tranſlates, *Bedolcha & margalitha*; *Bdelium & a pearle*: and hercin contradicteth your tranſlation: By this Thargum, *Beniamins* name ſhould not be engraven vpon the *laſper*, as you would have it: If you think the Thargum to be erroneous in this poynt, why do you follow the preſumption of it in an other which is vttred as it were vvith the ſame breath in the expoſition of the ſame verſe touching order of the names?

3. Againſt this Thargum Ieruſalemy, I may oppoſe the Thalmud Ierufalemy: though neither of them be indeed of any worth, yet of you they are much eſteemed and oft alledged; and of the Iewes this Thalmud is the more reſpected. In [e] it, among the opinions of other Rabbines, according to that vvhich I noted before out of the Babylonian Thalmud, the opinion of *R. Zabida* is recorded, touching the names in the Ephod, that *the firſt were not written according to the order* (of their birth) *becauſe Iehudah was King, but the later were written according to the order*. And ſo if, (as you affirme) the ſame order of engraving was obſerved both on the two ſhoulder ſtones and on the 12 in the breaſtplate, then this Thalmud Ieruſalemy affordes vs an order contrary to you and to your Thargum Ieruſalemy.

[e] Thalmud Ieruſalemy in Sotah Fol. 21. B.

Againe, for confirmation of the order deſcribed by you; you alledge that [f] *the ſame is alſo expreſſed by the Chaldee paraphraſt on* Song. 5. 14. *where ſpeaking of the 12 tribes engraved on 12 precious ſtones, he nameth them thus: 1, Reuben, 2 Symeon, 3 Levi, 4 Iudah, 5 Iſſachar, 6 Zabulon, 7 Dan, 8 Naphtali, 9 Gad, 10 Aſher, 11 Ioſeph, 12 Beniamin: who were like to the 12. celeſtiall ſignes, bright as lamps, and poliſhed in their works like yvorie, and ſhining like Saphirs.* I anſwer;

[f] Annot. on Exo. 28 21.

1. This Chaldee paraphraſe of *R. Ioſeph Caecus* (as it is commonly

monly taken,) I have "already ſhewed to be moſt fabulous ſuperſtitious and erroneous, a fit match to be alledged as witneſſe with your Thargum Ieruſalemy; neither of them being of any credit: vpon the words of the former Chapter, *Song. 4. 6 vntill the day break and ſhadowes flee away*, &c. this paraphraſt ſpeakes like a charmer or Magician, ſhewing vs a diſtinction of devilles, making ſome to be *night ſpirits*, ſome *morning ſprights*, and ſome *noone ſprights*: as alſo a way of putting them to flight by the ſmel of the perfume in the ſanctuary: not much vnlike to the [g] chaſing away of the feed Aſmodeus by the perfume of the heart and liver of a fiſh. The expoſitions which this paraphraſt gives on ech chapter of this Song, are a pregnant proofe of the authors inſufficiency to be allowed as a witneſs in theſe controverſies.

"Pag. 390.

[g] Tobit. 6. 9. & 8. 2.

2. To go no further then this paraphraſe on this verſe which you alledge; vve may here obſerve how he erreth in the expoſition of the ſtones, in making the ſeventh to be a Beryll & the eight a ſaphir, manifeſtly contrary to the text, & contrary to you alſo: Had you fully ſet downe your allegation, as you do a part thereof; had you noted how this paraphraſt tranſlates the ſtones, ſo as you do his naming of the tribes, then the reader might eaſily have perceived either your authors errour, or els the refutation of yourſelf by his words cited in this place. But you did wiſely to leave out that which is againſt yourſelf.

3. This paraphraſt in this ſame place alledged, ſaith that the names of *the three Fathers of the World, Abraham, Iſaac and Iaakob were engraven togather with the twelve tribes*: Thus alſo it is recorded in both the [h] Thalmuds, viz. for ſo much as the letters *Tſadi* & *Koph* were not found in the names of the 12 tribes in the breaſtplate, therfore as *R. Samuel* ſaith, the names of Abraham, Iſaac, and Iaakob were written above the names of the tribes in the breaſtplate; and becauſe there wants alſo the letter *Teth* in thoſe 12 names, therfore as *R. Acha* ſaith there was written vnder them, *ſchibte jeſchurun*: or as *R. Moſes* Mikkotſi inoteth, *ſchibte jah*; And ſo by this meanes they would have all

[h] Thalmud Babylon in joma c. 7. Fol 73. Thalmud Ieruſalemy in joma Fol. 44. Sepher mitſvoth haggadol precept. affirm. 173.

the letters of the whole Hebrew Alphabet conteyned in the breastplate; to the end that any answer of God by vrim and Thummim might be delivered in the letters of the breastplate and so read and vnderstood. Seing these be their bold asser-
tiõs, who would not be afraid to take the testimony of these pre-
sumptuous Rabbines? And much more ought every minister of Christ to be ashamed to alledge their testimonies in his ex-
pounding of the scriptures, whiles with one breath they do at the same time send forth such vnsound fancies.

4. Even as you yourself alledge & repeate the words of this pa-
raphrast: his vanitie appeares further in this, that by way of my-
sterie these twelve stones are compared to the Zodiack, *like vnto the twelve celestiall signes, &c.* which k others yet have set downe more fully, describing the the fabrick of the world by the high Priests attire; The 4 elements they shew thus: the earth by the sylk, sea by the purple, ayre by the blew, fire by the skarlet co-
lour; the sun & moone by the 2 stones on the shoulders: the 12 signes of the Zodiack by the 12. stones in the breastplate: the thũders & lightnings by the soũd of the belles & pomegranates: the highest heavens by the holy crowne, &c. So your *Maimony* expounds many places of scripture. And the vanity of these presumptuous speculations is such that if there were nothing els it might justly deterre vs from bnilding our expositions vpõ their traditions, as you do. To give one instance more hereof in stead of many, and this touching these garments and orna-
ments of the high priest: *R. Simon* sayth, "As the offrings did serve to make reconciliatiõ for sins, so the garments also: That the *Coate* made attonemẽt for thẽ that had worne linsey-wool-
sey: Some say, it made attonement for them that shed blood, because it is written, *they dipped the coat in blood*: (*Gen.37.31.*) That the *Linnen Breeches* did reconcile those that had vncove-
red the shame, &c. That the *Miter* reconciled the proud in spi-
rit: That the *Girdle* did make reconciliation for theeves; and as some say for the frowardnes of heart: That the *Breastplate* of judgement did expiate them that had perverted judgement: That

k Iosephus antiq. Iudaic. lib. 3. c. 9.

l Mo. nebuch, chel. 2 perek. 11 & Chel. 3 per. 5.

m Thalmud Jerusalem, in Ioma. Fol. 41. col. 2, & 3.

That the *Ephod* did expiate their sin that had committed Idolatry: Their proofe is because it is sayd, *Without Ephod and Without Teraphim* (*Hos.4.4.*) That the *Belles of the Robe* did make attonement for an evill tongue: That the *Golden plate* vpon the forehead of the high-priest did reconcile the blasphemers: and their proofe is because it is sayd, *the stone sticked in his forehead* (*1.Sa.17 49.*) some say it did reconcile the impudent that had an hard face, their proofe is because it is sayd, *thou haddest a whores forehead* (*Ier.3.3.*) Others of them, as "*Ben Arama* out of *vajikra rabba*, do record this same mysteric: Bnt let those that seek the meaning of the holy Ghost, leave these things to the Rabbines, & let Iewish fables alone.

" In Akedath Isaak, portã. 51.

5. Against this Chaldee paraphrast may be opposed an other Chaldee paraphrast vpon the law going vnder the name of Ionathan, who though he be vaine, yet is he not worse then this; but he is one of the authors whom you yourself do // alledge in the exposition of Moses, and he (as is m confessed) placeth the names of the tribes vpon the stones in an other order then you would have them: so that one of the Chaldee paraphrasts speaks as much against you, as th'other doth for you Let them both alone and seek better warrant for your exposi-
tions of the holy scripture.

// Annot. on Exo. 39. 14.

m Advertis. sem. of corrup. N. 3.

In conclusion of this poynt touching the order of the stones, you say, n *The same order we shewed also from Maimony, to be vpon the two Berylls verse 10, except the transplacing of Bilhahs sonnes.* To this I answer, 1. the presumption of *Maimony* in this matter is already manifested before. 2. even this very exception serves for the refutation both of you and your *Maimony* for what warrant is there to make this exception, and to assigne a different order and place to the sonnes of Bilhah vpon the shoulders and vpon the breast of Aaron? what reason have you to follow such as without warrant do thus place and transplace the tribes according to their fancie?

n Annot. on Exo. 28. 21.

A Fruit of this your presumptuous intrusion touching the order of the names in the stones, is your errour about the translation of the stones themselves; and in speciall that you interpret o *jahalom* to be the *sardonyx*, which should have bene translated the *Adamant* or *Diamonde*, according to the example of the best translatours both new and old: For

o Annot. on Exo. 28 18.

1. The Adamant is knowne and found to be the hardest of all stones, resisting the power p both of yron and fire, neither broke̅ by the one nor molte̅ by the other: & therevpō in Greek named *Adamas* of the invincible force of it, not easily subdued: Herevnto agreeth the hebrew name *jahalom*, comming of the word to *strike with the hammer*: shewing that this stone is as the hammer of other stones, breaking them, but not broken by them: Herevnto agreeth the Chaldee name, q *Sabhalom*, so called of enduring the strokes of the Hammer. Herevnto agreeth the arabique name, *al mas* which r *Aben Ezra* and from him s *Kimchi* do note to be given vnto jahalom, because *it breaketh all other stones and boreth through the* Bdelium, &c. The Adamant is also in the Arabique named t *Diama* of *Dum* a word that notes durablenes and continuance: The *Persian Thargum* likewise gives such a name vnto this stone, as shewes the same nature of it: and calleth it u *loguard* having affinity with the word *garad* which signifyeth S*calpere* to cut or grave: and accotding to this *Pliny* saith of the Adamants; v *expetuntur a scalptoribus, &c. They are desired of engravers*, &c. It seemes that of this stone they have their *scalpra* or *scalpella*, instruments of cutting and engraving. Now seing the name *Iahalom* doth so fitly agree vnto the nature of the Adamant, it is against al reason to leave and change the fittest name, and in your translation to give a new name without the force and help of any new argument.

p Plinie, histor. nat. lib. 37, c. 4.

q Onkelos on Exo. 28 18.

Jonathan on Ezek. 28. 13.

r On Exo. 28. 18.

s In lib. radic. on jahalom.

t pentaglot. val. shind.

u In Dum.

v Natur. histor. lib. 37. c. 4.

VVhereas you say of the *Sardonyx* that w *It is a very hard stone like the Adamant or Diamond*: and Mr. Broughton also saith, that *it is the hardest next the Diamond, and fit for the notation of jahalom*; I ask for your proofe herein: where is your vvarrant that the *Sardonyx* is a very hard stone like the Adamant? It is vvonder you would not expresse it, if you had any. And besides, if it were as you say, that the Sardonyx were like vnto or next vnto the Adamant in hardnes: yet hereby you confesse that the Adamant excelleth in hardnes: and all reason requires that the thing which is most excellent in his kinde should beare the name or denomination above the rest, vnless some other necessary proofe vvere brought to the contrary.

w On Exo. 28. 18.

2. Seing the maner of the holy Ghost is to describe & commend vnto vs the vvorth of excellent things by x comparing them vnto precious stones and pearles: and in this place Exod. 28, the Lord vvould shew vnto vs the deare & precious account that he makes of his Children by engraving their names in these gemmes and setting them vpon the breast of his sonne figured by the high priest: seing also that the Diamond is y *esteemed of greatest price, not onely among gemmes, but above other humane things*; for this cause, you ought not to have changed the common interpretation, by leaving out the most precious Adamant serving most fitly to expresse the meaning of the Lord, vnlesse you could have brought vnto vs some rare and strong argument for your so doing. He that doth vnjustly take out the more precious stone, and in stead thereof put in a baser into the breastplate, doth thereby in some measure obscure and darken the counsell of the Lord, and hide the brightnes of his grace.

x Prov. 3. 15. & 8. 11 & 20. 15. & 31. 10. Mat. 7. 6.

y Pliny, Natur. hist. l. 37. c. 4.

3. Seing the counsell of God in appoynting this breastplate to be made, vvas (as in the rest of the tabernacle-vvorks to shevv his vvisedome and glory by giving gifts vnto men, & by z putting vvisedome into the hearts of all that were vvise-hearted; and in speciall, (as is of purpose largely described) by calling Bezaleel and *filling him With the spirit of God, in Wisedome and in understanding, and in knowledge in all Workmanship*: and yet more particularly by teaching him the art *to Work in gold, to ingrave in stone and to fill or set the precious stones in gold*: seing the Adamant is more hard to be engraven then other stones, & that therfore the wisedome of God in teaching them to set this stone in the

z Exod. 31. 1—6.

breastplate, might appeare rather more, then in setting of the other stones: for this cause, men ought not vvithout sure ground to remoove this stone out of the breast-plate, least they be found guilty of cutting off one speciall meanes and occasion of shewing and manifesting Gods wisedome and glory seing in all his works the Lord vseth to seek such occasions. Pliny a considering the hardnes of the Adamant, and withall the meanes that were found out to break the same by steeping it in the fresh and warme blood of a Goate, breakes out into admiration concerning this experiment, and acknowledgeth all such inventions to be the gift of some divine power or godhead teaching men such wisedome and skill. VVhether this invention of preparing the Adamant to be engraven by the meanes of goates blood, was found out in the dayes of Bezaleel at the making of the breastplate: or whether any other way proportionable vnto this was then vsed, it is vncertaine: Alwayes we are sure, that such rare invention and skill vvas vsed by the help of Gods spirit, as might justly moove men to break out into Admiration, and vvith Pliny to acknowledge the wisedome of a divine power teaching the same. Herevnto should men attend, and take heed of denying any meanes or occasion that might serve to manifest and demonstrate this glory of God.

a Vbi supra.

4. VVhen as you dispute against Mr. Broughton touching sylk or vvool in the high Priests Ephod: you alledge for yourself against him, the judgements and interpretations of divers learned men, as namely, of b *Tremellius, Iunius, Marcus Marinus in Arca Noæ, Munsterus, Vatablus, Pelicanus, Lyra, Arias Montanus, Forsterus, Avenarius*: If the judgement and interpretations of these men, vvere at that time of any weight for you against him, thē are they now at this time also of weight against both you and him, touching the precious stones in the high Priests Ephod: for there is never a one of these your ten authors but they are against you in this matter: none of them interpret *jahalom* to be a Sardonyx as you do: ech of them allowes a place for the *Ada-*

b Answ. to Mr. Broug. Pag. 3.

Adamant or *Diamond*, in the Ephod. And besides these, there are yet more then ten other witnesses, which do all of them contradict your translation of this stone; *Iohan. Buxtorfius, Mercerus, Pagninus, David de Pomis, Reuchlinus, Valentinus Schindlerus, Iosephus, Hierome, Calvine, and even that Greek translation* which you do so ofte alledge, though it have not the name of the Adamāt yet it hath not the Sardonyx: and to these may be added the testimony of other translatours in the *English, Dutch, French* Bibles & many others: and not one of them but they are in their translations & expositions of this word witnesses against you. It seemes you have taken the *Adamant* from the breastplate of the highpriest that you might set it in your owne breast, or in your owne forehead, and so by vertue thereof hardened your face not onely against all reason and judgement of the learned in this controversy, but against all the Churches of Christ by opposing them: By the vertue of this invincible & hard *Adamant* in your forehead you stand out against all the churches of God, and renounce the fellowship of every one of them.

But as *Mr. Smith* once vvrote for his separation, that c having *Iohn* the divine for him, he respected not vvhat all other divines could say against him: so you also flying vnto the Revelation of *Iohn*, for vvarrant of your translation, do tell vs, that d *jahalom, in Rev. 21. 20. is named in Greek Sardonyx*. And this also M. Broughton hath e told vs before you. In an other place you you say, f *you followed the translation of Iohn the Apostle Rev. 21 of whom you were perswaded in generall, before you knew the particulars, that he translated all the stones from Aarons breast to the heavenly Ierusalem. That you might most safely follow him* (you say) *none of grace will deny*. I answer; Though none of grace will deny that you ought to follow the Apostle, yet many of grace and learning will deny that you do follow him: your bare perswasion and therevpon your bold assertion that Iohn did translate all the 12. stones from Aarons breast; and that he named *Iahalom* in Greek *Sardonyx*, is no vvarant for any of grace to follow you herein. VVhere is your proof or shew of proof that

c Parallels p. 34. 35.

d Annot. on Exod. 28. 18.

e Advertis. of corrupt. M. 2.

f Answer to Mr. Brough. P. 37.

that Iohn did ſo tranſlate all the ſtones , as you ſpeake ? your bare perſwaſions and aſſertions that he did ſo do not help you,but make you more guilty of preſumption , in obtruding your conceits vpon the holy Ghoſt and taking the name of God in vaine. VVe ſee the names of the tribes themſelves are reckoned vp by the g holy Ghoſt in the Revelation with omiſſion of *Dan* , otherwiſe then they are reckoned in any place of the old teſtament:and how know you then , or how can any affirme that the very ſame ſtones mentioned Exod.28. are all without exception and omiſſion of any reckoned vp in Rev. 21. as by your tranſlation and annotations you make the ſimple to beleeve ?

g Rev.7.5. ..8.

Through this your preſumption in expounding the ſtones of the breaſtplate it comes to paſſe that you deale not ſo ſoundly in your controverſy about the ſupremacy of Peter,as otherwiſe you might have done: vvhen you vvould ſhew the vanity of the popiſh argument,taken from this , that *Peter* was named firſt among the Apoſtles , you declare it thus : h *The firſt foundation of the Wall of the heavenly Ieruſalem , was a Iaſper , the ſtone of Beniamin,th' Apoſtle Pauls tribe : Will you grant me hence to conclude that S.Paul Was head of the Catholique Church ?* In theſe words you give advantage to your adverſary , for thus might he anſwer you. 1 , it is preſumption to ſay that the *Iaſper* vvas *Beniamins* ſtone: your allegation of Exo. 28. is but an abuſe of ſcripture : you might as well have ſayd that the Iaſper was the ſtone of *Aſcher* or *Naphtalt*;being alike vncertaine. 2. though the *Iaſper* had bene the ſtone of *Beniamin* in Exod.28. yet could it not be the ſtone of Paul in Rev. 21. 19. becauſe thoſe 12. ſtones had the names of the Iambes twelve Apoſtles, of which number *Paul* vvas ſt none, but was diſtinguiſhed and reckoned apart from the twelve : vvhatſoever therfore may be ſayd for *peter* in other places,*paul* could not ſtep in to plead for any head ſhip above the reſt from that place. 3. Suppoſe the ſtones in Rev.21. had bene all of them , the vety ſame that vvere mentioned in Exo.28. yet could not the Apoſtles be diſtinguiſhed there

h Anſw. to Ioh. Anſw P.73.

i Rev.21. 14.

k Mat. 10. 1—5. & Act. 1.26

l Cor. 15. 5.8.

thereby or claime for preheminence in reſpect of the tribe, becauſe divers of them were of the ſame tribe being brethren , as *Peter & Andrew: Iames and Iohn ; Iames and Iude ;* and for ſome of the reſt they were happily of the ſame tribes with theſe: and therfore of neceſſity ſundry of them muſt have their names vvritten not vpon the ſtone of that tribe whereof they deſcended by birth,but on ſome other : and thus your inſtance faileth in the very ground thereof,and therfore cannot juſtly ſerve for ſuch a declaration of your reproof of their argument, as you intend thereby.

Laſtly,to conclude this poynt : to ſhew the folly of the Rabbines,and how vaine their teſtimony in theſe things is,obſerve their ſuperſtition and contradiction about an other of *Aarons* ornaments : for example, The Rabbines as is l obſerved , have three opinions , touching the golden plate , viz. 1. *R.Eleazar* ſhewes how the words engraven vpon the ſame vvere vvritten in one line,on this maner,*Holines to Iehovah* 2. *R.Levi*, thought if they were engravē in two lines thē the word *Holines* was written in the line below, & *To Iehovah* in the line above. 3,others as in *Moſes Mikkotſi* thinking they were engraven in two lines would have *Holines to* in the vnder line:& *Iehovah* above. Touching this plate,you obſerve out of Maimony,m *the letters were ſo gravē that they ſtood out above the reſt of the plate & were not cut inward:* which is a mere preſumption and rather refuted by the ſignification of the word there vſed to expreſſe that ingraving then approved by the ſame. And whither may men be led if they will hearken vnto theſe preſumptions as you have done touching the order of the ſtones in the Breaſtplate ? Let the example of *Druſius* be a warning to you and others , that they take not ſo much heed vnto Iewiſh fables: This learned man, by his too great regard of the Rabbines in their vvritings , was coloured with divers of their abſurd opinions : taking ſome of them for a certaine truth , and brought alſo to doubt and fluctuate about others : for example ; whereas the Rabbines write that Eſaws Angel wreſtled with Iaakob for the bleſſing

l Druſius comment. adloca diff. Exo.p.217 cap.52.

m Annot. on Exo.28. 36.

n R. David Kimchi in Hoſ. 12.

o Præterit. lib. 4. in Ioh. 11. verſ. 35.

p Præterit. lib. 10. in Apo. 19. verſ. 12.

q Ibid. in append. ad p. 415.

r Præterit. lib. 1. p. 6. 7

s Præterit. l. 10. p. 402

t In loca diffic. Lev. c. 61.

and n wept becauſe he could not prevayle, *Druſius* writes, o *if an Angel once wept; what marvel that Ieſus ſhould weep? and that the Angel did weep which wreſtled with Iaakob, it is certaine from Hoſ. 12. 4.* Whereas the ſuperſtitious Rabbines hold it to be a haynous crime & a matter of death for any (except the prieſts) to read or name this word *Iehovah* as it is written, herein alſo he followes them thus far; that he accounts it p *mere ignorance, if not blaſphemy, to hold that it may lawfully be read:* and after againe he ſaith q *he thinkes that no godly man which feares the Lord can with a ſafe conſcience vſe the ſame.* In his annotations vpon thoſe words, *a voyce from heaven Mat. 3. 17.* he ſaith, r *it was not ſo much a voyce, as Bath-kol,* or an Eccho; and in the ſame place noting out of the Rabbines 4. degrees of prophecy, he obſerves this *Bath-kol* to be the loweſt degree: and below vrim and Thummim. The ſeven ſpirits mentioned *Rev. 1. 4.* he notes to be s *Angelles:* and declares this by the counterfait ſtory of *Tobit. c. 12. 18.* & by the teſtimony of Ionathã ſpeaking of the ſevẽ arch-Angels that ſtand before God. Vpon the doctrine of the Rabbines, he profeſſeth that he is t *doubtfull and wavering in his minde whether Polygamie was forbidden by the law or not.* Thus was he caryed, but your danger of being caryed further, is ſo much the greater in reſpect of your preſumptuous eſtate of ſeparatiõ wherein you ſtãd: in the practiſe & profeſſiõ whereof (as if you were a new Prieſt riſen vp with vrim & Thummim to ſhew the errours of theſe laſt dayes) you arrogate vnto yourſelf alone, above all other miniſters the knowledge of theſe three things, viz. of a true Church: of a true miniſter: and of a true Chriſtian: name one Miniſter of Chriſte in the world, if you can that beſide yourſelf is able to diſcerne of theſe three things: And think ſeriouſly withall in the feare of God, whether you be not in danger of being blowen away with the vvinde of preſumption and errour, for vvant of true humility.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

OUr great partialitie in alledging theſe Rabbines is an other mayne offence in you; & this appeares in divers kindes:

Firſt, betwixt yourſelf and oppoſites; you are partial in blaming them ſo much for vſing the teſtimonies of men, whiles yourſelf do vſe them far more frequenly: you have often complained of me for making fleſh my arme in alledging the authoritie of men againſt you: even when I did it not, as hath bene ſhewed a before. Herein you ſeeme to be like vnto that famous vſurer who rejoyced to heare that ſin of vſury reproved, condemned and publiquely preached againſt: in hope that others thereby would vſe it the leſſe, that he might vſe it the more and have the more cuſtomers for his intereſt: but you are in this vnlike him and more blame-worthy, in that he onely reioyced to ſee others condemne it, whereas you your ſelf do often and openly condemne a practiſe, in the middes of your owne moſt immoderate vſe thereof.

a Pag. 45. 47. 50.

Secondly, in reſpect of the authors alledged you are very partial; whiles you alledge Infidels rather then the moſt learned Chriſtians endued with the ſpirit of wiſedome and vnderſtanding: yea ſo far that in your annotations even in Geneſis & Exodus alone you have alledged theſe Iewiſh writers more thẽ a thouſand times in exact number, whereas among them all I finde not the name of one Chriſtian vvriter from the Apoſtles time vnto our age once alledged by you. But to prevent this blame you ſay, b *The Chriſtian Fathers and Doctours becauſe they are vſually cited by other expoſitors abundantly: I thought needleſs to repete: and the rather for brevitie, which is requiſite in annotations.* But againſt this excuſe it is to be obſerved, 1. that as for the heathniſh writers though they be as vſually cited by other expoſitours, and though they be as commonly knowne as the Chriſtian Fathers and Doctours, yet you do very often alledge them,

b Preface to Annot. on Geneſis.

them, and repeat the common allegations of them formerly vſed by others and finde place enough for them among your anno:ations: ſhould not the Chriſtian writers therfore at leaſt have had as much honour as they, in your allegations? 2, you do alſo alledge and repeate many Iewiſh teſtimonies formerly alledged by others: If need be I can ſhew you manifold inſtances in your annotations; ſo that you had no cauſe vpon this pretenſe of rarenes to have alledged them ſo much: there being many excellent obſervations of ſome Chriſtian vvriters that are far more rare and vnknowne then ſundry of the Rabbinical teſtimonies alledged by you. 3, though ſundry of your Thalmudique teſtimonies be not commonly knowne, yet ſeing the moſt of them are vnproffitable, vaine traditions and fabulous matters: it had bene more proffit for the Chriſtian readers, and a greater help for their vnderſtanding of the ſcriptures to have alledged ſome of the beſt Chriſtian writers in ſtead of ſome of the worſt of thoſe Rabbines. 4, it is to be obſerved, that though you glory in the name of a Rabbine for every trifeling allegatiõ which you bring from them, yet when
[a] Annot. on Gen. 37. 35. by ſtealth you [a] alledge the rare obſervations of ſome Chriſtians, as that of *Hades* derived from *Adam*, and divers others: then do you conceale the names of the authors as if you were aſhamed to learne or borow any thing from them, you being ſeparate from ſuch a ſociety in the Church of God as they all embraced.

Herein you ſeeme to be like vnto the Iewes, who though they have their ſet forme of prayer or bleſſings which they vſe at the lighting of Candles; yet their canon is, [d] that they may not bleſſe for the candle which they light at the candle of the gentiles or of Chriſtians: ſo you, when you light your candle at the Iewes, in alledging any thing from them, as if there were ſpecial cauſe of bleſſing for it, your maner is to give them honourable titles of *Hebrew Doctours*, *Iew Doctours*, *Ancient Rabbines*, &c. and not onely that but without regard of that brevitie which you pretend, your maner is to alledge their teſtimonies at

[d] R. Alphes in Ilera-coth, cap 8 Fol. 42.

at large with the ſuperfluous and vaine titles they aſſume vnto themſelves, viz. *our ancient Wiſe men: our Rabbines of bleſſed memorie*, &c. But on the contrary when you light your candle at the Chriſtians, in expounding the ſcriptures, you ſmother their names in ſilence, as if you were aſhamed of them.

Thirdly, even towards the Rabbines themſelves you are very partiall, in alledging divers of the worſt ſort far oftener, then thoſe which are more proffitable among them. *Aben Ezra*, *R. David Kimchi*, *Ralbag or R. Levi ben Gerſom*, which have takē great paines to expound the words and phraſes in the text of the ſcripture, whoſe writings are far more proffitable then thoſe of *Maimony*, that ſpent his time moſt in expounding the Thalmud and the vaine traditions thereof, are yet very ſeldome alledged by you. Others that are not half ſo judicious and far more fabulous writings, as *R. Menachem*, *R. Eliezer*, *R. Bechai*, *the Thalmud*, *the Zohar*, *Tanchuma*, *Bereſhith Rabba*, *Elleſhemoth rabba*, *&c.* being the maine fountaines of blind ſuperſtition and the greateſt corrupters of Gods ordinances have moſt honour given vnto them by you. As for *R. Eliezer* whom in ſpecial you reckon to be one of [e] *the beſt and moſt ancient Hebrue Doctours*, whoſe *Pirkei* are often alledged by you: how many of his obſervations or teſtimonies be there, even of the beſt that you could chooſe and pick out of all his vvritings that are worthy to be recorded? From him you note that Adams dreſſing of the garden ſhould be his [f] *labour in, and keeping of gods law*: that God did [g] *cut off the feet of the ſerpent and curſe him*: that the vvindow or light which *Noah* vvas commanded to make in the ark, [h] *Was a precious ſtone hanged in the Ark, which gave light to all creatures which were therein*: that [i] *Melchizedek Was Sem*: that [k] *Iſaak Went Wieh his Wife, to Mount Moriah, to the place Where he had bene bound* (Gen. 22. 9.) *and prayed there*: that as the Chalde paraphraſt tranſlates Iaakobs dwelling in tents to be a *A Miniſter of the howſe of doctrine*: ſo others as in Pirkei R. Eliezer, that he dwelt in tents and [l] *ſtudied the law*: that [m] *Lentiles* were vvont to be eaten of men in their *ſorow and mourning*: and that *Iaakob did feed vpon Lentiles in mourning*

[e] Annot. on Ge. 14. 18.
[f] Annot. on Gen. 2. 15.
[g] On Gen. 3. 14.
[h] On Gen. 6. 16.
[i] On Gen. 14. 18.
[k] On Gen. 25. 21.
[l] Ibid. on verſ. 27.
[m] Ibid. on verſ. 34.

wing and sorow; for that the Kingdome and dominion and firstbirthright was Esaus: that the sonnes of Esau should not fall, vntill the remainder of Iaakob come and give to the sonnes of Esau, food of Lentiles with mourning and sorow and take from them the dominion, Kingdome and firstbirthright which Iaakob bought of him by oath: that
u On Gen. 29. 10. Iaakob u *as a mighty strong man rolled away the stone frō the welles mouth, &c. that the shepheardes saw it and wondred all: and were not able to rolle away the stone; but Iaakob rolled it away himself alone*:
x On Gen. 32. 32. that Iaakobs sinew being touched: x *it became like the fat of a dead thing: therfore it is vnlawfull for the sonns of Israel to eat of the sinew*, &c. that the
y On Gen. 37. 15. p man which met Ioseph in the field was *the Angel Gabriel*, called in Dan. 9. 21. *the man Gabriel*: that of the 20
On Gen. 37. 28. shekels of silver for which Ioseph was sold, q *every of the ten Patriarks, had two shekels to buy shooes for their feet*. These as it seemes are the best observations which you could finde in the best of the Rabbines: the choyse of the choyse: And yet of them all there is not one of them free from presumption. And cannot the holy scriptures be well vnderstood without these forgeries? In stead of these fictions you might have brought far more proffitable annotations from *Aben Ezra, Kimchi & Ralbag* before mentioned touching the words and phrases of scripture: but you prefer the worst, & give least honour vnto the best of them. It is true indeed that there are many fables also recorded in these Rabbines, as I shewed r before
Cap. 1. yet are they but drops in comparison of that flood of errour, presumption and curiositie which is to be found in others of
Ioa. Raim. censura. lib. apocr. tom. 1. prælec. 77. your most honoured Thalmudists: And as is observed by others touching *Kimchi*, so is it plaine for the other two also, that the fables rehearsed by them are not set downe as their owne assertions, but ordinarily in the name of others.

Lastly, in the writings of one and the same Rabbine you seeme to deale partially: The superstitious *Mishneh* of *Maimony* is most frequently alledged by you: but his *Moreh Nebuchim* which is of far better vse is scarsely touched by you in one or two allegations. This later work of his, being made long after his

his *Mishneh*, though full of Rabbinical vanitie, yet is not like to his former: in so much that the Iewes of France, as some do record, did themselves burne this his book because it seemed too much to favour the doctrine and profession of Christians.
t Nebiensis in Octaplo, Annot. in Psal. 68.

TO conclude, as these things do serve for a Glasse of your errour in alledging the Rabbines: so the due consideration of the Iewish errours here noted vpon occasion of this controversie, may justly serve for a Glasse of Gods most severe judgement against Israel, that we may justify and glorify him in the same. Hereby we see the u Children of the Kingdome bound hand and foote in the cords of these errours and cast out into the vtter darknes of obstinate infidelitie, superstition and blasphemy. Hereby we see the truth of Gods word, in the present wrath that lyes vpon them according to the ancient propheses w for blinding of their eyes and bowing downe their backes. Hereby we should learne to kisse the sonne least he be angry, and to hearken to the voyce of Christ in his Gospel, whiles it is called to day: when as we see the contempt thereof to be so fearefully avenged on this elect nation, by giving them vp so long a time vnto such horrible delusions, and by scattring some of them into all quarters, (even as the " Levites concubine cut into many pieces and sent abroad) that all the people of the earth might see and know the work of God vpon them for their dayly instruction. Hereby we may also learne to be touched with the miseries of this nation, holy in the root and still beloved for the fathers sake. As x Rachel is sayd to mourne for her Children slayne in Beth-leem and the coasts thereof: so may both Rachel and Leah be sayd to make lamentation for these reiected and dispersed tribes. The miseries of Desolate Ierusalem do call and cry vnto vs, lowder then ever they did of old, y *Have ye no regard, all ye that passe by the way? Behold and see if there be any sorow like vnto my sorow which is done vnto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce wrath.* VVhen we pray for them we pray for our selves: their con-

u Mat. 8. 12
w Ps. 69. 23. Rō. 11. 10
" Iud. 19. 29.
x Mat. 2. 18
y Lam. 1. 12

z Rom. 11. 12,&c.

conversion is our z riches & life to the vvorld. And we may be bold to make our prayers for them, having the special promise of God for their restauration. Arise therfore & put on strength o arme of the Lord: rise vp as in the old time and as in the ancient generations: turne againe the captivity of Sion, and take away the iniquities of Iaakob: Lord how long wilt thou be angry for ever; shall thy jealousy burne like fire? Remember thy covenant made with Abraham, Isaak and Iaakob, and call home thy banished: Let the new Ierusalem discend from heaven as a Bride trimmed for her husband in the conversiō of thy people: make away for thy redeemed: remoove the stones of offence, the Idolatries, superstitions, schismes and separations among Christians: Take away the vayle that is spread vpon the eyes of the Iewes, and shew thy salvation vnto them, that the whole earth may be full of thy glory shining in the face of Iesus Christ. *AMEN.*

---

o

ERRATA.

PAg. 48. l. 10. for *ear* read *are*: Pag. 107. 26. for *such* read *suck*: Pag. 208. read *Amram*. Pag. 384. in the margent, read, r *Pag. 369.* f *pag. 370.* Pag. 437. in the margent read, *Ketannah*.